

\$50,000,000 for improving waterways and for a deep waterway from the Lakes to the Gulf—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of W. W. Wilkerson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York City, for bill H. R. 17347, increasing the efficiency of the artillery arm of the service—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of women principals of New York City public schools, for appointment of a Secretary of Education—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Basel Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Frank Maloney—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAYES: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James T. Bonifield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Board of Trade of Templeton, Cal., and the Paso Robles Improvement Club, for purchase of the Henry ranch, San Luis Obispo County, as a military reservation—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of J. K. Bryant et al., citizens of California, against employment of Asiatic coolies on the Panama Zone and for the Chinese-exclusion law to apply to Japanese—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of the Graduate Nurses' Association of Connecticut, for the bill providing for regulation and control of professional nurses—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petition of Samuel Gompers, favoring restriction of immigration and for an educational test in the immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the New Jersey Society, Sons of the Revolution, for an appropriation to preserve the records of the Continental Congress—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Nebraska: Petition of the Nebraska Duroc Jersey Breeders' Association, against free distribution of seeds—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Nebraska State Swine Breeders' Association, against free distribution of seeds—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 85 citizens of Omaha, indorsing the Hamilton prisoners-of-war bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio: Petition of Frank W. Gratten et al., against employment of Asiatic coolies on the Canal Zone—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Trades and Labor Council of East Liverpool, Ohio, against the ship-subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Elbel Company, of Canton, Ohio, for an appropriation for a waterway from the Lakes to the Gulf—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Parlett Lloyd, of Baltimore, Md., against any claim of pension attorney for securing pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the joint executive committee on the improvement of Philadelphia Harbor, for an appropriation to deepen Delaware River to a 30-foot channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the National Private Commercial School Managers' Association, for revision of the postal laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Review, Alliance, Ohio, against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNAPP: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Calvin J. Ripley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAW: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry C. Vedder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Massachusetts State Board of Agriculture, for an appropriation to suppress the gypsy moth—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Bertrand Rockwell, for legislation to increase the pay of the Regular Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of the New Jersey Society, Sons of the Revolution, for an appropriation to print and publish papers of the Continental Congress—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. McMORRAN: Petition of citizens, churches, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and Epworth League, of Richmond, Mich., for the Littlefield bill, to limit the effect of the regulation of commerce between the States—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. NORRIS: Petition of the Nebraska State Swine Breeders' Association, against free distribution of garden seeds—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PARKER: Petition of the National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, for restoration of the canteen in the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDELL of Texas: Petition of citizens of Black Bridge, Grayson County, Tex., for an appropriation for the upper Red River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of citizens of Sangamon County, Ill., for reciprocal demurrage on cars—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Business Men's Association of Winchester, Ill., against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Papers to accompany bills for relief of estate of Enoch R. Kennedy, Burwell J. Curry, heirs of A. A. Mills, and estate of Marcus M. Massengale—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RIXEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of heirs of Joseph W. Robertson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of the Massachusetts board of agriculture, for an appropriation to stay the gypsy moth—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCOTT: Petition of the Department of Kansas, Grand Army of the Republic, urging equalization of pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: Petition of citizens of Garvin, Okla., for an appropriation to improve upper Red River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SPIGHT: Papers to accompany bills for relief of heirs of Charles T. Alexander and Jane B. Alexander, Nancy P. Garrison, estate of W. M. Ham, and estate of John Houston—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STERLING: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Laura A. McKesell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN WINKLE: Petition of the New Jersey Society, Sons of the Revolution, for preservation of records of the Continental Congress—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WILSON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Minnie Mae Blackburn—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of William McKinley Camp, No. 12, Spanish War Veterans, for restoration of the Army canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, January 23, 1907.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

Mr. ANSELM J. McLAURIN, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

THE PHILIPPINE TARIFF.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a cablegram from the governor-general of the Philippine Islands containing an appeal of the agriculturists of La Carlota, province of Negros Occidental, for the repeal of the Dingley tariff and for the establishment of an agricultural bank in that province; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills:

H. R. 3980. An act granting a pension to Frank G. Hammond; and

H. R. 15769. An act granting an increase of pension to William W. Bennett.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 22334. An act to amend an act to regulate the sitting of the United States courts within the district of South Carolina;

H. R. 24537. An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 24538. An act making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

- S. 319. An act to reimburse Abram Johnson, formerly postmaster at Mount Pleasant, Utah;
- S. 350. An act for the relief of the heirs of Joseph Sierra, deceased;
- S. 503. An act to reimburse James M. McGee for expenses incurred in the burial of Mary J. De Lange;
- S. 505. An act for the relief of Jacob Livingston & Co.;
- S. 538. An act for the relief of Charles T. Rader;
- S. 1169. An act for the refund of certain tonnage duties;
- S. 1218. An act for the relief of Louise Powers McKee, administratrix;
- S. 1231. An act to reimburse the Becker Brewing and Malt-ing Company, of Ogden, Utah, for loss resulting from robbery of the United States mails;
- S. 1236. An act to authorize payment to the Henry Philipps Seed and Implement Company for seed furnished to and accepted by the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year 1902;
- S. 1344. An act for the relief of John M. Burks;
- S. 1648. An act for the relief of the Hoffman Engineering and Contracting Company;
- S. 1668. An act for the relief of the administrator of the estate of Gotlob Groezinger;
- S. 1894. An act for the relief of P. S. Corbett;
- S. 1933. An act for the relief of George T. Pettengill, lieutenant, United States Navy;
- S. 2262. An act for the relief of Pay Director E. B. Rogers, United States Navy;
- S. 2368. An act for the relief of the Postal Telegraph Cable Company;
- S. 2578. An act for the relief of Alice M. Stafford, administratrix of the estate of Capt. Stephen R. Stafford;
- S. 2724. An act for the relief of Della B. Stuart, widow of John Stuart;
- S. 2964. An act for the relief of the L. S. Watson Manufacturing Company, of Leicester, Mass.;
- S. 3574. An act for the relief of John H. Potter;
- S. 3581. An act providing for the payment to the New York Marine Repair Company, of Brooklyn, N. Y., of the cost of the repairs to the steamship *Lindesfarne*, necessitated by injuries received from being fouled by the U. S. Army transport *Crook* in May, 1900;
- S. 3820. An act for the relief of Eunice Tripler;
- S. 3923. An act to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the artillery of the United States Army;
- S. 4348. An act for the relief of Augustus Trabing;
- S. 4800. An act for the relief of Peter Fairley;
- S. 4926. An act for the relief of Etienne De P. Bujac;
- S. 4948. An act for the relief of W. A. McLean;
- S. 4975. An act giving the consent of Congress to an agreement or compact entered into between the State of New Jersey and the State of Delaware respecting the territorial limits and jurisdiction of said States;
- S. 5446. An act for the relief of John Hudgins;
- S. 5531. An act for the relief of Francisco Krebs;
- S. 5560. An act for the relief of Matthew J. Davis;
- S. 5675. An act for the relief of Maj. Seymour Howell, United States Army, retired;
- S. 6166. An act for the relief of Edwin S. Hall;
- S. 6299. An act for the relief of Pollard & Wallace;
- S. 6898. An act concerning licensed officers of vessels;
- H. R. 23114. An act extending to the support of Bellingham, in the State of Washington, the privileges of the seventh section of the act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement; and
- S. R. 13. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to award the Congressional medal of honor to Roe Reisinger.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the credentials of HENRY E. BURNHAM, chosen by the legislature of the State of New Hampshire a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1907; which were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. MILLARD presented the credentials of Norris Brown, chosen by the legislature of the State of Nebraska a senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1907; which were read and ordered to be filed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PLATT presented a petition of Washington Camp, No. 17, Patriotic Order Sons of the American Revolution, of Elmira,

N. Y., praying that an educational test be included in the immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the American Federation of Labor, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of New York City, N. Y., and a petition of the Albany Ministerial Association, of Albany, N. Y., praying for an investigation into the existing conditions in the Kongo Free State; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Lyon Mountain and Hopkinton, N. Y., and a petition of the congregation of the First Baptist Church of Jamestown, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GEARIN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Union, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Portland, Sheridan, Lake Creek, Svenson, Clackamas County, and Multnomah County, all in the State of Oregon, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring certain places of business in the District of Columbia to be closed on Sunday; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CULBERSON presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ennis, Tex., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the Improvement Club, of San Miguel, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the purchase of the so-called "Nacimiento ranch," for Army maneuvers; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DILLINGHAM presented a petition of sundry citizens of Barnet Village, Vt., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Rupert and Dorset, in the State of Vermont, praying for an investigation into existing conditions in the Kongo Free State; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Nashua, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the West Washington Citizens' Association, of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation to divert the extension of Prospect avenue NW. so that it will form a junction with the Foxhall and Conduit roads; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Southwest Citizens' Association, of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation to amend the existing smoke law so as to include locomotives of steam railroad companies operating within the District of Columbia, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BURKETT presented a petition of the congregation of the United Evangelical Church, of Verdon, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PILES presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Satsop, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. OVERMAN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Hildebran, N. C., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring certain places of business in the District of Columbia to be closed on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented the petition of Hugh Kirkman, of North Carolina, praying for the enactment of legislation for the relief of Joseph V. Cunningham and other officers of the Philippine Volunteers; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Caldwell County and Blowing Rock, in the State of North Carolina, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CARMACK presented a petition of sundry citizens of Tazewell, Tenn., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Waltham, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of Thomas G. Grandfield, of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation for the relief of Joseph V. Cunningham and other officers of the Philippine Volunteers; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SPOONER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Madison and Albany, in the State of Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. HALE. I report back from the Committee on Appropriations the bill (H. R. 24541) making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and for other purposes, with an amendment. I shall call up the bill the first thing after the routine morning business to-morrow morning.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. BERRY, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment:

A bill (H. R. 23383) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the city of St. Louis, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Missouri, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River," approved June 25, 1906; and

A bill (H. R. 23939) to authorize the board of commissioners of Lake County, Ind., to construct a bridge across the Calumet River in the State of Indiana.

Mr. BURNHAM, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 19758) granting an increase of pension to Josefa Montano;

A bill (H. R. 19807) granting an increase of pension to John W. Marean;

A bill (H. R. 19818) granting an increase of pension to William F. Clinkscales;

A bill (H. R. 19858) granting an increase of pension to Richard E. Clapper;

A bill (H. R. 19871) granting an increase of pension to John G. Kean, alias Cain;

A bill (H. R. 19872) granting an increase of pension to Richard E. Hassett;

A bill (H. R. 19873) granting an increase of pension to Robert Webb;

A bill (H. R. 19891) granting an increase of pension to Edwin D. Bates;

A bill (H. R. 19915) granting an increase of pension to Greenleaf W. Crossman;

A bill (H. R. 19923) granting an increase of pension to Bettie Ferguson;

A bill (H. R. 19949) granting an increase of pension to Charles Van Ostrand;

A bill (H. R. 19963) granting an increase of pension to Charles Carter;

A bill (H. R. 19990) granting an increase of pension to Susan F. Christie;

A bill (H. R. 19998) granting an increase of pension to Eunice Cook;

A bill (H. R. 19651) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Prendergast;

A bill (H. R. 19661) granting an increase of pension to Jacob McWilliams;

A bill (H. R. 19639) granting an increase of pension to Lucy A. Kephart;

A bill (H. R. 19672) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McDermott;

A bill (H. R. 19703) granting an increase of pension to Seth Chase;

A bill (H. R. 19708) granting an increase of pension to William A. Leffer;

A bill (H. R. 19713) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Mason;

A bill (H. R. 19715) granting an increase of pension to Susan M. Brunson;

A bill (H. R. 19716) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Johnson;

A bill (H. R. 19722) granting an increase of pension to William H. Burns;

A bill (H. R. 19738) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin St. Clair; and

A bill (H. R. 19885) granting an increase of pension to Frank Scherer.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 20029) granting an increase of pension to John B. Maison;

A bill (H. R. 20064) granting an increase of pension to William C. Arnold;

A bill (H. R. 20078) granting an increase of pension to Walter M. English;

A bill (H. R. 20085) granting an increase of pension to Robert Lafontaine;

A bill (H. R. 20087) granting an increase of pension to Cassia C. Tyler;

A bill (H. R. 20088) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Thurmond;

A bill (H. R. 20096) granting an increase of pension to Theresia Bell;

A bill (H. R. 20117) granting an increase of pension to Preston J. Michener;

A bill (H. R. 20129) granting an increase of pension to John Lemly;

A bill (H. R. 20146) granting an increase of pension to Harriet C. Kenney;

A bill (H. R. 20154) granting an increase of pension to George H. Dyer;

A bill (H. R. 20166) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Salmon;

A bill (H. R. 20198) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Maddox;

A bill (H. R. 20199) granting an increase of pension to Joseph N. Cadieux;

A bill (H. R. 20219) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Downing;

A bill (H. R. 20222) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Joseph;

A bill (H. R. 20229) granting an increase of pension to Jehu F. Wotring;

A bill (H. R. 20250) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McBride;

A bill (H. R. 20269) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Galloway;

A bill (H. R. 20272) granting an increase of pension to James L. House;

A bill (H. R. 20279) granting an increase of pension to Edmund Hostetter;

A bill (H. R. 20292) granting a pension to Howard William Archer;

A bill (H. R. 20303) granting an increase of pension to John Crowley;

A bill (H. R. 1144) granting an increase of pension to Franklin McFalls;

A bill (H. R. 20327) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Downie;

A bill (H. R. 20350) granting an increase of pension to Theodore F. Reighter;

A bill (H. R. 20351) granting an increase of pension to Peter M. Simon; and

A bill (H. R. 20357) granting an increase of pension to Jane Aldridge.

Mr. BURKETT. The bill (H. R. 12560) for the relief of John C. Lynch was referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations. The committee have been unable to get a quorum. I may say, and the Senator who introduced the bill is very anxious that it shall be considered at the present session. I therefore report back the bill and ask that the Committee on Indian Depredations be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 7495) to define the status of certain patents and pending entries, selections, and filings on lands formerly within the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota;

A bill (H. R. 23889) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue deed of conveyance to Lyman Ballou to certain lands in Custer County, S. Dak.; and

A bill (H. R. 23927) excepting certain lands in Pennington County, S. Dak., from the operation of the provisions of section 4 of an act approved June 11, 1906, entitled "An act to provide for the entry of agricultural lands within forest reserves."

PROTECTION OF CERTAIN ENTRYMEN.

Mr. FULTON. I am directed by the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 190) extending protection of second proviso of section 1 of the act of December 21, 1904, to certain entrymen, to report it favorably without amendment, and I submit a report thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The Secretary read the joint resolution; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It provides that where entries were allowed by the local land office prior to December 21, 1904, of lands purchased from persons who were bona fide settlers on March 5, 1904, such entrymen shall be entitled to the protection extended by the second proviso of section 1 of the act of December 21, 1904, if they have continued to comply in good faith with the requirements of the settlement laws.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE FOR HOMESTEAD SETTLERS IN IDAHO.

Mr. CARTER. I am directed by the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 85) authorizing temporary leaves of absence for homestead settlers, to report it favorably without amendment. I call the attention of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN] to the report.

Mr. HEYBURN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The Secretary read the joint resolution; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It grants homestead settlers upon the public domain in the State of Idaho a leave of absence from their land for a period of three months, and provides that the period of actual absence under the resolution shall not be deducted from the full time of residence required by law.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. BLACKBURN introduced a bill (S. 8014) to authorize the National Safe Deposit, Savings and Trust Company of the District of Columbia to change its name to that of National Savings and Trust Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 8015) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Hunter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BURKETT introduced a bill (S. 8016) to increase the pension of Wesley Coppock; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. STONE introduced a bill (S. 8017) granting an increase of pension to Watson L. Corner; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MCCREARY introduced a bill (S. 8018) to limit the hours of employment of telegraph and telephone operators on all railroads engaged in interstate commerce in the United States to eight hours in each day of twenty-four hours, and to prescribe the time of their eligibility; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. MALLORY introduced a bill (S. 8019) granting a pension to Dempsey Hill; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 8020) for the relief of John D. Toppin and George W. Beard, United States Navy, retired; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. PILES introduced a bill (S. 8021) granting an increase of pension to John F. Martine; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (S. 8022) for the relief of the Baptist Church of Dardanelle, Ark.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 8023) granting an increase of pension to Harry N. Medbury; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FRYE introduced the following bills; which were sever-

ally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 8024) granting a pension to Susan J. Rogers; and
A bill (S. 8025) granting an increase of pension to Jedediah S. Cronkhite.

Mr. TALIAFERRO introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 8026) for the relief of the First Baptist Church of Jacksonville, Fla.;

A bill (S. 8027) for the relief of the trustees of the Bethel Baptist Church (colored) of Jacksonville, Fla.; and

A bill (S. 8028) for the relief of the First Presbyterian Church of Jacksonville, Fla.

Mr. TALIAFERRO introduced a bill (S. 8029) granting an increase of pension to Martin B. Bartholomew; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. OVERMAN introduced a bill (S. 8030) to correct the military record of Hezekiah A. Wood; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 8031) granting an increase of pension to Smith F. Carroll;

A bill (S. 8032) granting an increase of pension to George W. Barnhardt;

A bill (S. 8033) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. White;

A bill (S. 8034) granting an increase of pension to Jacob M. F. Roberts; and

A bill (S. 8035) granting an increase of pension to William Nichols.

Mr. CLAPP introduced a bill (S. 8036) for the relief of S. Kate Fisher; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 8037) for the relief of Bernice Farrell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BULKELEY introduced a bill (S. 8038) granting an increase of pension to John F. Ackley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SCOTT introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 88) authorizing the building of dams and locks Nos. 9, 10, and 12 in the Ohio River, West Virginia and Ohio; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. DILLINGHAM submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$7,200 to purchase certain land for park purposes in the District of Columbia, intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$9,000 for paving Second street NW. from U street to Bryant street, intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MONEY submitted an amendment relative to the employment by the Court of Claims of additional employees, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$3,000 for the purchase of additional ground for a site for a municipal almshouse, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TELLER submitted an amendment proposing to grant increased rank to certain officers on the retired list of the Army, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT TO OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. TELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the omnibus claims bill; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

CHANGES IN DISTRICT STREET RAILWAY TRACKS.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Monday next, immediately after the routine morning business, if there shall be no appropriation bill under consideration, I will ask the Senate to further consider the bill (S. 6147) au-

thorizing changes in certain street-railway tracks within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. This is the bill which proposes to extend the street railway tracks to the Union Station. It is a matter which has become acute, and I hope to be able to have the bill passed at that time.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE AT PORT OF NEW YORK.

Mr. PLATT. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 7146) to provide for the compensation of the appraiser of merchandise at the port of New York, which was reported favorably from the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments, in line 3, after the first word "That," to strike out the words "from and after the approval of this act;" in line 5, after the word "be," to strike out the words "the same as that paid to the naval officer and the surveyor of said port, to wit;" and in line 6, after the word "dollars," to insert "per annum;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the compensation of the appraiser of merchandise at the port of New York shall be \$8,000 per annum.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 24538. An act making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 24537. An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 22334. An act to amend an act to regulate the sitting of the United States courts within the district of South Carolina was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. M. C. LATTA, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed the following act:

On January 22:

S. 6578. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1895, and to amend an act amendatory thereof approved June 20, 1906.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask that the appropriation bill now on the table be taken up for consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on the legislative, etc., appropriation bill.

Mr. CULLOM. If that bill is up, I desire to state that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] has given notice that he wishes to speak this morning, but in view of this appropriation bill being on the table, and as it has been here for some time, he has very kindly consented to defer his speech until after the bill is disposed of.

Mr. BERRY. I can not hear the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BACON. There is so much conversation in the Hall it is impossible to hear what is going on.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Business will be suspended until the Senate is in order.

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator from Arkansas says he did not hear what I said. I stated that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] desires to speak this morning, but the appropriation bill having been here for some time, he has very kindly consented to allow the appropriation bill to be disposed of before he enters upon the speech he desires to make. Of course I understand that the appropriation bill has the right of way, but I like to be accommodating to Senators, as I was yesterday, when they ask such favors.

Mr. BERRY. Do I understand that the appropriation bill goes on now or does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; it goes on now.

Mr. CULLOM. The appropriation bill is now up for consideration.

Mr. BERRY. Very well, Mr. President.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Even if under the rules the appropriation

bill did not have the right of way, of course, in view of the fact that it has been on the table so long, I would be very glad to yield. I would yield, under the circumstances, even if it was not a matter of right upon the part of the Senator from Illinois. I have been assured, however, by the Senator from Illinois and Senators on both sides of the Chamber that the bill will probably not take very long, probably not more than until half past 1 o'clock. I merely desire to express the hope that that is true, for the reason that the remarks which I wish to submit to the Senate were to have been submitted a week ago, and were then postponed until Monday on account of the absence of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], and from Monday until to-day because of the Brownsville discussion.

I am very glad to yield to the Senator, but I again express the hope that the appropriation bill will not take longer than until half past 1.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I desire to make a remark or two.

This bill passed the House and was considered by the committee of the Senate and reported to the Senate and passed the Senate and again went to the House. The House made an amendment to it, which is in the nature of an increase in the salaries of Cabinet officers, Speaker of the House, and Vice-President, and the Members of both Houses of Congress. The first part of that provision was in the bill as sent to the Senate, and was disagreed to by the Senate. The House has amended it, and disagreed to the other amendments of the Senate. It is back here in that shape.

So far as our committee is concerned, we desire that that subject shall be submitted to the Senate itself for consideration, and it is before the Senate on the question of agreeing to the House amendment respecting these several salaries, and on my motion. I moved that the Senate concur in the House amendment as made, and that is the question now before the Senate.

Mr. PATTERSON. Let it be read.

Mr. BERRY. The Senator from Colorado desires to have the amendment read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the action of the House of Representatives.

The Secretary read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, January 18, 1907.

Resolved, That the House disagrees to all the amendments of the Senate, except amendment No. 222, to the bill (H. R. 21574) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes, and agrees to amendment No. 222 with the following amendment: Omit the matter stricken out by the said amendment and insert the following:

"That on and after March 4, 1907, the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Vice-President of the United States, and the heads of Executive Departments, who are members of the President's Cabinet, shall be at the rate of \$12,000 per annum each, and the compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Porto Rico shall be at the rate of \$7,500 per annum each."

Mr. MALLORY. Will the Senator from Arkansas permit me to make a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BERRY. Certainly.

Mr. MALLORY. I should like to inquire if the report is now open to an amendment in this body—that is, that particular part of it which has just been read relating to the increase of salaries?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is of opinion that it is open to amendment.

Mr. MALLORY. I have an amendment to offer, which I will offer now.

Mr. BERRY. I trust the Senator will not offer the amendment until after I finish my remarks.

Mr. MALLORY. Very well. The Senator from Arkansas desires me to wait until he finishes his speech before I offer the amendment. I will do so.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I saw it stated in one of the city papers this morning that I was going to speak in favor of an increase of the salaries of Members of Congress. In view of the fact that I have always been opposed to such an increase and have stated it more than once on the floor of the Senate—one time, I remember, as long as five years ago—and that I have been against it continually, and on Monday last, when the bill was up, I stated—and it is in the Record—that I was opposed to it, I regret that the newspaper men were misinformed. What remarks I shall make, and it can hardly be called a speech, shall be against an increase of the salaries.

I regret that the Senator from Illinois has determined to have this amendment disposed of in a way different from the usual method of the Committee on Appropriations. So far as I remember, wherever a general appropriation has come to the Senate and amendments were offered to it—and there always are

numerous amendments—and went back to the House and they disagreed to the amendments in whole or in part or agreed to an amendment with an amendment, in all such cases, I think, heretofore when the bill came back to the Senate the rule was for the Senate to insist upon its amendments and let the bill go to conference. Why a difference should be made in this particular bill I do not understand.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BERRY. Certainly.

Mr. CULLOM. As I understand it, the same course has been frequently followed. I want to say that, so far as I was concerned in having anything to do with it, my chief purpose in taking this course is to have the Senate settle the question whether this increase of salary shall be made. Instead of going to conference to be considered by the conferees, it is only open and fair that the Senate itself should have a vote on that particular question, so as to settle it.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I entirely agree with the Senator from Illinois that it ought to be settled by the Senate and by a vote of the Senate; but after the bill had gone to conference and the other amendments to it had been disposed of it would have been easy to have reported back this amendment, leaving it to the Senate, the conferees declining to take the responsibility. However, that is not very material except that it has precipitated this matter somewhat, and it looks like in a hurried way at a time before it was generally expected.

Mr. President, I wish to state the history of the bill as connected with this amendment. I presume it is in order for me to state, as they appear in the Record proceedings of the House of Representatives. This is the general legislative appropriation bill which was passed by the House of Representatives. While it was pending in the House an amendment was offered to increase the salaries of Senators and Members to \$7,500 a year, not to take effect, however, as I remember it, until the Sixty-first Congress. There was a yea-and-nay vote had upon that proposition in the House of Representatives, and it was beaten by a majority of eighty-one, I think. The House, however, did put a provision in the bill which provided for the increase of salaries of the Vice-President, the Speaker of the House, and the Cabinet officers to \$12,000. When the Senate committee met there was no question before that committee in regard to the increase of salaries of Senators and Members, but the committee unanimously disagreed to the provision in the bill providing for an increase of the salaries of the Vice-President, the Speaker, etc. The bill was reported back to the Senate, and the Senate made no effort whatever to place this provision in regard to Senators and Members of the House upon the bill. There was no amendment offered in the committee, none offered in the Senate, to make this increase.

When the bill went back to the House they disagreed to all other amendments of the Senate, except the amendment which struck out the increase of salary for the Vice-President and Speaker, etc. To that they agreed with an amendment. They proceeded to strike it all out, to retain the provisions in regard to the increase for the Vice-President, the Speaker, and the Cabinet officers exactly as they were put there before, and to add to it the provision that is now under consideration—to increase the salaries of Senators and Members of the House to \$7,500.

The RECORD shows that on the question of adopting this amendment in the House of Representatives no yea-and-nay vote was taken; that only 34 Members, I think, rose to second the demand for the yeas and nays; the Speaker declared that was not a sufficient number, and it passed without a yea-and-nay vote, the difference between the other amendment which they had voted down and this being that the other amendment, I think, did not go into effect until the Sixty-first Congress, while this takes effect in the Sixtieth Congress, on the 4th day of March next. Those are the facts connected with this bill.

It seems to me, Mr. President, in a matter so delicate as the one of Members of Congress raising their own salaries, it would have been far better if it had been in a separate bill, thoroughly considered, and a direct vote by the yeas and nays taken in each of the Houses to see how they stood on the question. That is my view of it. However, I have no desire to criticise the other House, because they have a right to take such procedure in regard to the passage of amendments to bills as they desire.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that I am opposed to this increase, and have always been opposed to it, for several reasons. In the first place, I deny that \$5,000 is grossly inadequate as compensation to a Senator or Member of the House. I deny

the statement so often made that they can not live on it. Numbers of them have lived on it for years. But a few years ago, I do not remember how many, Senators and Members received the same compensation and were compelled out of their own pockets to pay for the clerk hire and for the messenger service, whatever it was, that their business demanded. Since that time in the Senate a clerk with a salary of \$1,800 a year is allowed each Senator, and each Senator is allowed a messenger at \$900 a year; so the least of them—those who are not chairmen of committees—have a secretary and a messenger, whose pay combined amounts to \$2,700. That has taken off each Senator the burden of paying for his clerk hire and for his messenger service.

In this bill there is a provision for an allowance of \$1,500 for each Member of the House of Representatives for clerk hire; so that Representatives, as well as Senators, do not any longer have to pay out money, as they once did, for the services of a clerk.

I repeat that, while there are a number of Senators here who doubtless could make more than \$5,000 a year, yet, Mr. President, I am inclined to the opinion that, taking the other House and the Senate together, there is not one-half of them who ever has made or who ever could make \$5,000 a year if engaged in any other business. That is my judgment about it, though I may be wrong.

As I said before, while it is true that a Senator or a Member of the other House can not save money from his salary, it is not true that he can not live upon it.

Besides that, Mr. President, it ought to be remembered that, as a rule, it is scarcely otherwise than that we are not in session for more than twelve months in every two years. The short session lasts but three months, and the long session rarely ever lasts over nine months. That would make but one-half the time of a Congress only that Senators and Members of the other House are required to be here. In the meantime they have the right, or at least they exercise the right, of practicing law or engaging in any other business which they may see proper. They are enabled in that time to increase the amount of their salary.

Again, when I am told that for members of the Senate and of the other body the salary of \$5,000 a year is wholly insufficient, I will say that I do not think the statement is borne out by the facts. But even if the salary be too small, I insist that an increase of 50 per cent on that salary can not be justified.

It is often said that there has been an increase in the cost of living. That is true; but every clerk in the Government Departments, every carrier of rural mail throughout the United States, all mail clerks, many of whom stand on their feet for ten or twelve hours continuously during the twenty-four, have likewise to pay for the increased cost of living. They, too, can come with the same complaint and say that their salaries ought to be increased. Indeed, I see that the Department clerks are now asking for an increase of 20 per cent, as are also the carriers engaged in the rural free-delivery service. If the cost of living has been increased to Senators and Members of the other House, it has also been increased to every other man engaged in any kind of business, Government employees as well as others; but though the cost of living has increased, Mr. President, those men have not the power to increase their salaries as we propose in this bill, and have the power to do, to increase our salaries. I think that is another reason why this amendment should not be adopted.

But the main reason, the principal reason, the greatest reason for my opposition to the proposition is that, as to any man who knew what the salary was when he came here, who sought the office and urged the people to elect him to it, who knew precisely what the law allowed, I do not believe that it lies in his mouth to say, "I can not live on this salary, and I propose to vote to take money out of the Treasury to increase it."

It seems to me that it is not a proper thing for any man to say that he will take this money while others claim that they are equally entitled to an increase; that we alone should have increased salaries, although we agreed to serve at the salary fixed at the time of our election, and every man here and in the other House knew what it was at the time he accepted the position. I say, under the circumstances, that everyone ought to be held and bound by that understanding.

Besides that, there is no reason on earth, so far as I can see, why any man here who is unable to live on the salary and who it is claimed can make so much more money at home should remain here. If he does not desire to stay, he can resign at any minute or any hour.

Will any Senator stand upon this floor and say that he believes that a salary of \$7,500 per annum will get a better class of men in the other House and in the Senate than we have to-day?

Does he think that the ability of Senators or Representatives or the efficiency of the service here will be increased by increasing salaries? I do not think so.

Mr. President, this is a matter for each Senator to settle for himself. I have felt constrained to give my reasons because of the peculiar surroundings. I wanted it known and have it go into the Record that this is no new idea with me, as I think every member of the Committee on Appropriations will bear witness. For years I have always opposed such an increase on every occasion, even when I had five years of service ahead of me in the Senate at the time when I made such opposition.

But it is said, Mr. President, that the people of the country are demanding this increase; that they are urging it; that they are pressing their representatives in this body and in the other to vote for it. Some of the men who voted "nay" on the first vote in the House of Representatives, when the yeas and nays were called, have told me that they thereby incurred the displeasure of their constituents at home, who did not approve of their voting "nay." It may be, Mr. President—I do not know—that the fear if they continued to vote "nay," as no doubt their judgment dictated was the right vote, may have been one reason why there were only 34 Representatives who then stood up on the demand for the yeas and nays—the fear that they might be criticised for voting "nay" on this proposed increase of compensation. I do not say that that is the reason, but I say that the Record shows the fact to be as I have stated.

I simply desire to repeat once more, Mr. President, that I want each and every Senator to understand that I am not here to try to dictate in any way or to assume the right to criticise his action, whatever his vote may be. I could have, and can have, but one purpose in view, and that is the good name of the Senate and the House of Representatives. I think that this proposed amendment ought not to be passed and I think, if it is passed, the Senate would be flooded with applications for increase of salaries by every clerk and every mail carrier, by all the officials in the consular service, and practically by every man who is in the service of the United States. It is impossible for me to see how any Senator who supports this amendment can refuse to give to them the same increase on the ground that the cost of living is increased, that being the reason why he votes it to himself.

But, Mr. President, the Senate must settle this matter for itself. I simply wanted to give the reasons why I will not vote for the amendment. There has never been a day in the twenty-two years I have served here when I would have voted for such a proposition.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I move to amend the amendment—and that motion takes precedence of the motion to agree to it—by striking out all after the word "each;" that is, all that part of the amendment which relates to the salaries of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Porto Rico. I send the amendment to the desk, and upon that amendment I shall have a few words to say, and only a few.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out from the amendment of the House of Representatives the following language:

and the compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Porto Rico shall be at the rate of \$7,500 per annum each.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have been curious and somewhat interested in looking into the compensation paid to the members of various legislative bodies in different countries of the world. I find, by examining into this question, that we are to-day receiving a higher rate of compensation than is allowed to the members of any legislative body in the world.

To the members of Parliament in Great Britain, as is well known, no compensation is paid, while in the Congress of the United States Senators and Representatives receive \$5,000 per annum each, with 20 cents mileage, counting each way, coming to Washington and returning to their homes.

The senators and deputies of France receive only \$1,800 per annum, with free transportation on the state railroads. The members of the upper and lower houses of Hungary receive \$1,000 per annum and \$333.33 for house rent. In the Netherlands the members of the first chamber who do not reside at The Hague during the sessions receive \$4 a day, and the members of the second chamber receive \$800 per annum and actual traveling expenses. In the German Parliament or Reichstag the members are allowed a compensation of \$800 per annum, provided they are in attendance. In Italy there is no compensation for the members, but free transportation is given them. In Sweden the compensation of the members is \$327 per annum, with mileage for each session. In Greece the members receive

a compensation of \$360 per annum. In Belgium the members of the lower house receive a compensation of \$800 per annum, with free transportation, while the members of the senate serve without compensation. In Portugal the members receive no compensation. In Austria actual traveling expenses are allowed, and a per diem compensation of \$4.16. In Switzerland the members of the lower chamber receive a per diem of \$3.80 and have free transportation. In Norway the members of the Odelsting and Lagthing receive a per diem allowance of \$4.29, with their actual traveling expenses and medicines and medical attendance while they are in session. In Denmark the members of the Landsting and Folkething are allowed a per diem compensation of about \$2.40. In Roumania the members of the senate and house receive a per diem of \$4.75 when in actual attendance. In Bulgaria, if living at the place of session, the members receive a per diem of \$3, and, if living out of the place of session, traveling expenses are allowed and a per diem of \$4.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. In comparing the salaries paid to members of legislative bodies in foreign countries and the salaries paid here, does not the Senator find the proportion to be about the same as that between the wages paid to laborers in foreign countries and the wages paid to laborers in this country?

Mr. NELSON. Not at all.

Mr. President, I have called attention to these figures not so much to compare the amount of salaries paid in each of these different countries with the amount paid here, but for the purpose of calling the fact to the attention of the Senate that throughout all these rates of compensation runs the same central idea, that it is not intended to pay the members of these legislative bodies a salary, as you would to a hired man or a clerk or employee or the head of a department, but it is simply to give them a sufficient compensation to pay their actual expenses.

The position we occupy is distinct from that of perhaps any other public functionaries. We are not simply here hired out to work for the Government for a given amount of salary, but we are here because, first of all, we feel our position to be a post of honor, one of public duty; and if the Government of the United States gives us sufficient compensation for a modest living, I think we are amply compensated. Our position in this respect is very much like that of the soldier in our Volunteer Army in time of war. No one will contend that the compensation which the Government pays the soldier in such an emergency is a sufficient compensation for the actual work he performs and the danger he incurs. Most of them would receive more if engaged in almost any other employment. But they agree to accept it because it is a great public duty, and the Government gives them a modest and moderate compensation not at all commensurate with the work, but by way of aiding them to support their families in comfort.

In our case I am aware of the fact—and we can not disguise it or mince matters here—that we are not here like great diplomats from foreign countries, who feel it to be a part of their duty to enter into the social field, expend liberally in various directions and in great social functions, thereby incurring large expense. There are some of our brethren here who are fortunate enough to be able to enter that field and to follow in the course of such diplomats. We are very glad that we have such members in our body; we are very glad that they are able to occupy that position; but the most of us are not in that position, and we ought to be content that the Government of the United States gives us a compensation to provide us with a modest and respectable living, and not be ambitious to shine like diplomats in the social world.

There are other fields, Mr. President, where we could increase salaries, in my opinion, to much better advantage. Take our poor rural mail carriers, who only receive a paltry compensation of \$720 a year for their services, and they have each to furnish from two to three horses. We had better take the amount it is proposed to confer upon members of this body in the way of increased salary and confer it upon the rural mail carriers, instead of adding it to our salaries.

If this had been a modest increase of a thousand dollars a year, so as to make the compensation \$6,000, it would not have been so bad; but it is proposed by this amendment to increase our salaries 50 per cent, to add to them \$2,500 per annum each. I feel, Mr. President, in view of the position I occupy here, in view of the honor that the people of my State have conferred upon me, that, if the Government pays me a sufficient compensation so that I can live here and at home in a modest way, I should be quite content. I do not want to be degraded into the

mere position of an employee who is simply working for the sake of a salary.

There is another thing that came to my attention in connection with the Panama Canal. It seems to run through some spheres of this Government and through other circles that a man's usefulness, a man's value in the public service, is measured by the compensation you give him; that the bigger the salary you put up the greater the results you will obtain. I think our experiences go to show that it is not always the highest-priced men or the men who get these enormous salaries who perform the most valuable service for the Government. We find many times in the Departments here an humble clerk, receiving a salary of from twelve to fourteen or fifteen or sixteen hundred dollars a year who performs more valuable service than the head of his division, or the bureau officer, or even the head of the Department, in some instances.

To my mind, Mr. President, above all things else, it seems to me degrading the high status of the position of a Senator or Representative in Congress to put us on such a basis that we are simply here working to get a salary, simply seeking the office for the sake of getting a large salary. I can not for the life of me concur in that idea.

As I said at the outset, this is a post of honor. We are not here as mere hired men of the Government. Our value here and the efficiency of our service is never measured by the amount of salary. In the early days of the Republic, when the salaries were much more modest than they are to-day, I think nobody would contend that the public service was not as faithfully performed by the Members of the two Houses of Congress as it is to-day.

Mr. President, I trust the amendment that I propose may be adopted. I have no intention to take up the time of the Senate further, though there is a good deal I should like to say on the subject; but in view of the fact that my friend from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] is about to enter upon the discussion of a very important bill, I feel unwilling to delay the Senator any further on account of this matter.

Mr. GALLINGER. I trust, Mr. President, that the amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] may not be agreed to. I am one of those who have no fear of doing justice to myself and my associates as I see the matter of justice. I have been of opinion all through my public career, and especially of late years, that the compensation given to members of the two Houses of Congress was utterly inadequate, and I have never hesitated to give expression to that view.

Mr. President, it must be remembered that if added compensation is to be given it can only be given by the Congress itself. That is the only remedy within our reach. The First Congress submitted a proposed amendment to the Constitution in these words:

No law varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives shall take effect until an election of Representatives shall have intervened.

That proposed amendment, Mr. President, was defeated in the First Congress, and it was defeated by the votes of some men who had helped make the Constitution itself.

Salaries of Members of Congress were first fixed by the act of September 22, 1779. Salaries were changed March 10, 1796, March 19, 1816, June 22, 1818, August 16, 1856, and again in 1866, when the present compensation was fixed. The act of July 28, 1866, reads as follows:

That the compensation of each Senator, Representative, or Delegate in Congress shall be \$5,000 per annum, to be computed from the first day of the present Congress, and in addition thereto mileage at the rate of 20 cents per mile, to be estimated by the nearest route usually traveled in going to and returning from each regular session, etc.

Mr. President, every one of the acts to which I have called attention were retroactive acts. That, I think, is a matter that has possibly not been called to the attention of Senators as a rule. The act under which we are now drawing our salaries provided retroactive pay from March of one year to July 28 of the next. That feature is eliminated from the bill now under consideration, and if the proposed increase is allowed it will be the first law on the subject that has ever received the approval of Congress and the Chief Executive that did not carry back pay in some form or to some extent.

It will be remembered that on the 3d day of March, 1873, an act was passed known as the "salary-grab act," which increased the compensation from \$5,000 to \$7,500. That act was approved on the 3d day of March, one day before the adjournment of Congress, as I remember, and it carried back pay for that Congress. It attracted the attention of the country because of that fact. A great uproar was raised, and at the next Congress the act was repealed and the act of 1866 was reenacted, under which act we are now receiving our compensation.

The First Congress, Mr. President, fixed its salary; the Second

Congress fixed its salary, and so on from the foundation of the Government until the present time. That being the fact, it will be seen that the proposed legislation is no innovation.

Mr. President, I have been a somewhat attentive student so far as this matter is concerned. I have read the papers of the country, and I think I have some knowledge of the public sentiment on this question. Perhaps I ought not to undertake to speak for any other State than the one which I in part represent, but I am pleased to be able to state that so far as I know there has been no discordant sound in the State of New Hampshire. The people of that State and the press of that State have, with a unanimity that has been exceedingly gratifying, stated that the proposed increase was an act of simple justice and that the law ought to pass.

I have here a little country newspaper, Mr. President, edited by an old soldier—the Bristol Enterprise—published in a small town in my State, and in a brief editorial I find this:

Senator GALLINGER has opened the fight in the Senate for the increase of the salaries of Members of Congress to \$7,500. This is none too large, and, indeed, \$10,000 would only be reasonable.

I think that every newspaper in New Hampshire, certainly every one that has come to my attention, has said that the proposed increase was one that ought to be granted and to which no exception ought to be taken.

We have been increasing salaries, Mr. President, all along the line except our own salaries. There is a proposition before the present Congress to increase the salaries of our ministers to foreign countries, or of those of them who are receiving the same salaries that we propose to give ourselves, to \$10,000. Why, Mr. President, there are some private secretaries receiving almost as large salaries as Members of the two Houses of Congress are, and that will be found by an examination of the bill that is now under consideration. The heads of various bureaus of the Government get more than Senators are receiving. The members of the Interstate Commerce Commission get twice as much. So do certain judges, and their pay continues during life, whether they are on the bench or not.

I will not call attention to the salaries that are being paid in connection with the building of the Panama Canal, because they are rather startling in some instances.

Mr. President, there is one feature of this matter that I think it is well to say a word about, and that is that the expenses members of the two Houses of Congress must necessarily meet are not to be measured by hotel bills, or by the cost of travel, or by any of the ordinary expenses of life. There are political expenditures that we can not escape. It would be of interest, I think, to some people outside who are criticising this proposed legislation if they could examine the check books of some Senators and see what expenditures they have been called upon to meet and which they could not refuse.

The members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the judges on the bench, those who represent us in foreign countries are not required to make political contributions, but there is not a Senator or a Representative in Congress who has not to do so at every election, and it is right that he should do it, but it takes a very considerable amount out of the small salary he receives.

I think I am stating the exact truth when I say that there are on my desk now three calls for money that I can not refuse to give—small in amount in each case, but nevertheless a burden. "The delegation" are always the ones who are called upon first to contribute to all sorts of things in their States, and they have, as a matter of fact, to treat those calls with the consideration that a man who owes his position to his fellow-men must of necessity do. The proposed increase, as I said, Mr. President, is an act of simple justice to ourselves, and we ought not to further discriminate against ourselves.

It is said by some that we can resign. Of course we could. Mr. President, I venture to say that if every official of this Government from the President down should resign to-day the places could be filled by men who would not exact one dollar in the matter of salary. I think I am not mistaken in saying that every place in this body can be filled by men without salaries. The Presidency itself can be filled by men who would not count the salary a matter worth considering for a moment. But that is not any argument why when men are called to high official positions they should not be adequately paid for their services.

Mr. President, I talked more than once with the late Senator Hoar concerning this matter. He was very insistent upon securing what, I think, was a proper increase in the salaries of the judges, and he gave a great deal of time to that matter and succeeded in getting the salaries of the judges increased. He said to me not long before his death that he intended to offer a bill in the Senate increasing the salaries of the members of the two Houses of Congress, and it is interesting to refer to his Auto-

biography of Seventy Years, where, in volume II, page 267, is found the following:

The salary of Senators and Representatives is shamefully small. This is a great injustice, not only to members of the two Houses, but it is a great public injury, because the country can not command the service of able men in the prime of life unless they have already acquired large fortunes. It can not be expected that a lawyer making from \$25,000 to \$50,000 a year, or a man engaged in business whose annual income perhaps far exceeds that amount, will leave it for \$5,000 a year. In that way he is compelled not only to live frugally himself, but, what is more disagreeable still, to subject his household to live in the humblest style in a costly and fashionable city into which wealthy persons are coming from all parts of the country.

The Members of Congress have a great many demands upon them which they can not resist.

The English aristocracy understands this pretty well. They give no salary at all to the members of their House of Commons. The result is that the poor people, the working people, and people in ordinary life can not get persons to represent them from their own class. That will soon be true in this country, if we do not make a change. I suppose nearly every member of either House of Congress will tell you in private that he thinks the salary ought to be raised.

Mr. President, those were the views of a great Senator who served his country long and who left this body a much poorer man than he was when he entered it. I think the words on this subject of Senator Hoar, whom we all loved and whose memory we all revere, ought to have great weight with us in determining our votes on this question.

I do not think there is any argument whatever in the statistics of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] showing that those who represent other countries are getting even less salary than we are getting at the present time. The conditions are all different; the circumstances are all different, just as they are different in every other department of life; and it seems to me that the only thing we ought to look at in this connection is the question whether or not our experience has taught us that we ought to have a salary adequate to enable us to meet the obligations of life in this great city, where everything is exceedingly expensive, and where we ought as Senators of the United States to be put in a position where we can at least do the decent thing toward our families and toward those who have a right to exact from us some consideration when they come to the great capital of the nation.

I trust that all amendments to the House amendment will be voted down, and that the Senate will agree to the motion made by the Senator from Illinois to concur in the amendment made by the House of Representatives.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire merely to say a few words, as I am obliged to go to a conference committee; but I do wish to say something on this subject, because it is one which I have had much at heart for a good many years, from my observation of the extreme inadequacy of the present salary in very many cases, and in both branches of Congress.

In England, as the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] pointed out, they do not pay their members of the House of Commons at all. It is the tradition—

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator is usually so accurate that I dislike to question his statement, but unless I am very much mistaken, since the last election and the entry into Parliament of a very large number of representatives of labor unions or what are known as the "working classes," I recall having seen in some paper a statement that Parliament has passed a law giving salaries for the first time in the history of their Parliament. I may be mistaken. It may have been merely introduced and not passed.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator, I am certain, is mistaken. No such act has passed.

The English system came down from the time when the House of Commons was made up almost exclusively of landowners, men of considerable income. In later times poor men have entered the House of Commons, notably among the Irish members, and many of the Irish members in the House have been paid by contributions from their own countrymen and from their sympathizers in this country. Now, they have a large number of labor members, and those men are at this moment paid, unless I am greatly misinformed, by contributions of their labor unions. That seems to me the worst possible system, and it is bound to come in any representative government where there is a large democratic representation, because otherwise poor men can not serve in the representative bodies, and I think we shall find that England will perceive under present conditions the mistake that has been made and will come to the system of paying.

We have always paid in common with all the other represent-

ative bodies, and it seems to me perfectly plain that what we want to do and what we should aim at doing is to pay to Senators and Representatives a salary which will enable them to live becomingly, in accordance with the great position of trust which they hold, which may relieve them, if they desire to be relieved, of the effort to make money in other ways.

Mr. President, we have not raised the salaries for forty years. The salary was fixed at \$5,000 in 1866, and except for a brief interregnum of the bill of 1873 it has not been raised. It is perfectly clear, I think, that to the great body of Representatives and Senators \$5,000 is a wholly inadequate salary. There may be a few here and there to whom it is entirely sufficient. To undertake to pay men for Government service what they could earn outside, at the bar or in business, would of course be an absurdity and no one would suggest it for a moment. But it is proper, and it is not only proper but merely decent, to my mind that Senators and Representatives should have a salary which would enable them to live here as they ought to live, and not feel as my colleague, Mr. Hoar, felt at the close of his life, when he had come to be an old man, the continual pressure of a narrowness. He gave his entire life to the service of the country. He laid aside a great practice at the bar in order to continue in that service. I never knew a man who cared less about money than he did, and yet I know that in his latter years it was a continual pressure, living even as simply as he did in this city, to get along with the salary that was allowed.

The scale of living has advanced greatly since 1866. We pay more to our Representatives and Senators than is paid abroad, because the whole scale of wages in this country is much higher and it is more expensive to live in this country. I hope that the amendments will be voted down, and that the Senate will concur with the House. The American people are a generous people. They have no desire that men whom they consider fit to represent them should scramble along as best they may with a pittance in Washington. I am certain they desire them to be justly and properly paid, and I think, Mr. President, that it is for the dignity and the decency of official life here to pay a salary proportionate to the importance of the office which is held by Senators and Representatives, and which will enable them to live not extravagantly, but simply and decently with their families in a manner becoming to their situation.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, in view of the situation in which the Senate finds itself this morning, if I knew the yeas and nays on these questions would be ordered, I should perhaps say nothing. As it is uncertain, however, whether such a vote will be ordered by the Senate, I simply desire to say, without stating reasons or elaborating those reasons, that I favor the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], and am opposed to the amendment proposed by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, I rise simply for the same purpose. If a ye-and-nay vote shall be taken, I shall vote against the entire amendment of the House of Representatives. I do not think I have a right to come here upon a salary of \$5,000 and then vote to raise that salary. I am opposed to it upon principle and on policy.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, this is a very important question, and more important to the country, in my judgment, than it is to the individual Senators. I hold to the opinion, which has guided me during almost twenty years of life here, that a Senator ought not to be engaged in any business which can be affected by his vote, and if he finds himself confronted here with a proposition in the determination of which he is pecuniarily interested, if his private business is such that it will be affected by his vote on that proposition, I think he ought to withhold his vote.

The country is entitled to the best service we can give it and to our undivided attention. I do not agree with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] that the vacation belongs to Senators and during those vacations they can engage in some other business in order to make additional money.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator from Idaho permit me?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. DUBOIS. Certainly.

Mr. BERRY. I said that, at any rate, they did engage in other business during the vacation, and I say again that they will equally do so if the salary is raised. It would not prevent them from doing so.

Mr. DUBOIS. There is not a time during the year when a Senator ought not to think of the public business. There are 90 men here to legislate for 80,000,000 people. They are selected men. They are picked men. But it has now come to the pass where every Senator is forced to make money outside of

the salary which he receives unless he has an income from some other source.

There are, I am sorry to say, not a great many left who belong to the class of Senator Hoar who go into public life early and devote their undivided attention to public questions and not to the amassing of a fortune. I think our legislation ought to be in the line of getting that class of men when young into the public service and keeping them there. Every Senator here knows that you can not properly live on the present salary. There is not a Senator here who is married and has a family whose family has not occupied in his community a good social status. They have been the leaders at home almost in every instance in all social matters. By that I mean that the wife has interested herself in charitable and worthy things at home. She has helped to upbuild, the same as the husband has, and it is not fair that when she comes here she shall be excluded entirely through lack of funds. She must accept social attentions. She must discharge the obligations which are imposed upon her by the office which her husband occupies.

A young man now properly hesitates, if he is engaged in a business which is bringing him several thousand dollars a year, in the law, or any other, to accept this high position, knowing that his business will be dissipated and that at the end of his service he will be left without anything, either money or business. I think the twenty-five hundred dollars additional would enable a Senator to live comfortably and also to keep up his social obligations in a creditable way. I am talking now of poor Senators. I know, of course, that the salary is nothing to a great many, but I do not want it to come to pass that no one can aspire to a seat here or enter upon a public career which will be permanent unless he has money. The tendency is too strongly in that direction. We should employ all proper means to check it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. DUBOIS. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I interrupt the Senator from Idaho simply for the purpose of stating what I meant to state when I occupied the floor before, and that is that the proposed increase to members of the two Houses of Congress will impose a per capita burden upon the people of this country of just 1 cent and 4 mills. If we make this increase, each person in the United States will be taxed 1 cent and 4 mills more than each person is taxed at present.

Mr. RAYNER. How much is the whole annual amount—the whole annual increase?

Mr. GALLINGER. About \$1,000,000.

Mr. DUBOIS. I do not think the people will figure this out in dollars and cents. If I read the signs of the times correctly and accurately measure the trend of events, the people want good service, undivided service, and honest service. They do not want to force their Representatives to go on the lecture platform, to write magazine articles, or to look around here and there for a business opening to eke out the salaries which they receive here. They want them to devote their attention to the interests of the people, with a mind free, so that they will not belong to this class or to the other and can legislate equally for all of them.

I think the \$2,500 a year will make a tremendous difference to Senators. They can not live on \$5,000 a year, because they must maintain two homes. They must contribute, as the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] says, to campaign expenses. Their friends come here. Our western people appreciate that more than those who live close by. Good friends, close friends, call on us. The least we can do is to ask them to take luncheon with us or to take them to the theater, and every time a little church is to be built we are called upon for a small contribution. There are innumerable things which confront us in the way of demands for money, owing solely to the position we occupy, and the additional \$2,500 would not only enable us to meet those as we should meet them and to meet our social obligations as we should meet them, but it would also enable that class of Senators to carry a fair life insurance.

In my opinion, it is of more interest to the people of the country than it is to individual Senators and Members that this bill should pass as reported by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MALLORY. Mr. President, for the same reason that actuated the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] to state how they proposed to vote upon this amendment, I beg the indulgence of the Senate for a few moments.

Mr. President, this is an exceptional piece of legislation. It affects every Senator very intimately and affects him in a pecuniary way. I do not propose to set up my judgment in a

matter of that kind against the judgment of my colleagues in this body, but I think, nevertheless, that by reason of the peculiar character of the question it is one which can be judged of only by ourselves individually, each one for himself.

I will say that I am inclined to think that under existing conditions in this country the present salary of Senators and Representatives is insufficient for the majority of those gentlemen. I will go further and say that were I to vote for the pending amendment, I do not believe any considerable number of my constituents would find fault with me for so doing. Nevertheless, Mr. President, I feel under obligations to myself, without reference to anybody else or to my constituents, to vote against the amendment.

It occurs to me that we are here in a position somewhat analogous to that of a trustee. The people of the United States have confided to Congress the power to invade the Treasury and to appropriate the money therein for any purpose that in the judgment of Congress is desirable or proper. There is in that position a sacredness and a sanctity that in my judgment should never be overlooked and never be abused. In passing such a measure as this we will establish a precedent. The trustee who takes the funds of the cestui que trust and applies it to the payment of his own services is reprobated whenever it is attempted.

Mr. President, as briefly as possible, because I am aware that no one wants to hear a lengthy discussion of this matter, I will say that I believe the difficulty which presents itself to my mind can be obviated by an amendment I propose to offer. That amendment simply makes the proposed law take effect after the expiration of the term of every Senator who votes on the passage of the amendment. If my amendment to the amendment is adopted, I shall vote for it. My amendment I will read for the benefit of the Senate. It is as follows: Strike out the words "nineteen hundred and seven" and insert "nineteen hundred and thirteen" in lieu thereof. If it is adopted I shall be very glad to vote for the amendment as amended.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, merely a word. I can not conceive that the Senate will so demean itself as to refuse to give anybody who wants the yeas and nays an opportunity to show just how he stands. I have just been reelected to this body. If I live I shall stay here six more years. I shall vote for an increase of the salary because I think it is right, not because I will get more money by it. I would have much preferred to have voted for it last year before my election for a third term, without opposition, so that those of my constituents who might object could have had a chance to determine whether or not they would continue me here. If we are ever to have an increase, men must vote here sometime affecting themselves, because the Senate being a continuous body we could never have any increase at all unless some Senators shall vote to increase their own salaries.

The proposition of the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY] to have this take effect six years hence is ludicrous, because no one expects it can get many votes but his. Possibly others may agree with him, but I do not see it in that light. I believe that the people are much more concerned—

Mr. MALLORY. Will the Senator from South Carolina allow me to interrupt him?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. TILLMAN. Certainly.

Mr. MALLORY. I intended no humor at all.

Mr. TILLMAN. I was not speaking of humor. The Senator could not by any possibility be supposed to indulge in humor.

I was just saying I believe the people are very much more concerned about the character of the work we do here and the genuineness of the representation of the people, the honesty and loyalty of their Senators, than in any other quality of a Senator or about a proper and just increase of pay. There is great complaint that this body represents corporations and wealth and does not represent the people. If that be true, more's the pity.

It is not a question of the million dollars which this increase will take from the Treasury. It is a question whether we shall have men here who will fritter away hundreds of millions on favored interests, on special classes, on this job or that, rather than to subserve the public welfare by trying to watch the Treasury and do that which is just. I did not consider the question of salary when I asked to be sent here. My constituents are not considering it now. They want the best service, and I have tried to give it to them.

So far as the responsibility for this lies, I am prepared to take it, and if any considerable number of my constituents find any fault I am ready to resign and let the people pass upon the question.

Mr. DANIEL. The Constitution of the United States, Mr. President, has confided to one body, the Congress of the United States, the obligation and duty of fixing its own salary. In doing so the people contemplated and have a right to require that every man shall deliver his honest judgment, whether he puts himself in a disagreeable position or no. I am well aware that most of us have an interest in the question of salary. The people knew that when they sent us here, and they knew it was one that we could neither avoid, dodge, nor confer upon anyone else.

It is exceedingly painful to a man of delicate sensibilities to take part in a matter in which he inevitably is interested. That should not constrain his mind, but he should remember that he is but one of many who are in a similar case, and he should act according to his own judgment and responsibility and do exactly what he thinks right, whatever its consequence.

There are 90 Senators and 386 Representatives. We must give our judgment as to all of these public servants and say what is right for them, and self should not sway the scale either to make anyone of them increase the salary or shrink from voting as he thinks. We can not be higher than the Constitution. That has made us the judges. We can not, if we would, rise higher than the Constitution. Accepting its truth, we should exercise it without suspicion of ourselves and fearless of those who may take counsel of suspicion.

It is my conviction that the interests of this country require that it should enlarge the salaries of its Senators and Representatives; and so thinking and believing, I wish to stand and be counted on that side.

So far as the House of Representatives is concerned, there is one thing that we should remember. Of all the hundred thousands of officeholders and appointees whom we have in this country the House of Representatives is the sole body of public servants who are chosen by the people. They are the people's immediate representatives. While for years and years they have swollen the salaries of judicial and executive officers they have kept themselves down at so low a rate that they can not with such a salary support their families in the appropriate way in this city and conduct themselves in the most efficient way to serve the people without the strictest economy nor often without a certain niggardliness that is foreign to their duty, disposition, and spirit.

I believe it is in the interest of popular government that those intimate and immediate servants whom the people have sent here to represent them amid an environment which may be tempting to the weak and which is a burden to the strong should have the tools of their trade to work with in a workmanlike way. Only thus can they fulfill their office.

In a great body there will be diversified classes of men, but we must suppose every member to be worthy of his place. There is no man who is intellectually, morally, and in education and ability worthy of his place in the Congress who could not, in my humble judgment, with a due disposition of his talents, support himself more comfortably with a less salary at home or realize more if he bestowed upon his private business the talents which he bestows upon the public service. At least such is the rule. But there are some men eminently qualified for duty who have not money sense. They may be scholars profoundly versed; they may possess great knowledge of law and of men and things, but they may know not common necessities nor possess the faculty that takes in the mechanics of money. Daniel Webster was of their kind, and both Clay and Calhoun were of a sort of kindred spirit. Such men may make great Senators and great Representatives, and have done so.

All should be paid a reasonable amount, not in extravagance, not in penuriousness, not in excess, and not in meanness, but the old common-law valuation, the sum that a good and intelligent man is reasonably worth.

It is the interest of the masses of the people that those poor in fortune but sound in character and of patriotic and able mold should come to Congress. They can not do it without sacrifice as matters now stand, nor can they do it without stinting the means of accomplishment and having anxious minds as to their present situation. Sacrifice is right when needful, but government should not organize sacrifice.

As to the Senate, it is a body which in some respects has larger burdens than the House. It represents the States as well as the people. Each Senator has on an average nearly 1,000,000 constituents. The Senate is both an executive body and a judicial one, and sometimes when the House adjourns to its home the Senate is retained here to consider the most difficult and perplexing questions that concern the nation and the fortunes of the people not only of this country, but of the whole world in their correlation with us.

We will be criticised whatsoever we do, for every public man

lives in an atmosphere of public criticism. But, Mr. President, there is scarcely a Senator here who does not know the fact that men accustomed to the plain respectabilities of life—I do not speak of those who belong to fashion and seek its association, but the men of the great middle class who are accustomed to the refinements of life—can not keep their families in the city of Washington and support themselves out of the present salary. The incidentals of their association are those of constant expenditure, and this salary, \$5,000 or \$7,500—and indeed if you should increase it to \$10,000 or \$12,000—would not enable them to go into the social whirl with the diplomat and the gentleman of money. They are not “in it” now and could not be “in it” if the salary were multiplied by three or four.

It is not for “society,” in the sense that the word is used by those who have the means and the taste to indulge in entertaining and in the luxuries that mark the lives of the rich in great cities, that salaries should be raised, but for those who seek efficiency in their places and would not be lacking in the hospitable nature that their people have at home, and which should not be denied by their representatives.

No place in the society of fashion can come in the purview of a \$5,000 salary, nor in the \$7,500 which it is proposed to give the Senators and Representatives. The man who strikes an even balance here with either sum would be a man worthy to be promoted as a financier to become the Secretary of the Treasury. The English House of Commons, as has been pointed out, gets no salary. What is the result? Less than a majority is a quorum. Half the members are seldom in the Parliament hall. Absenteeism is the rule. Many are supported by outside interests which they are sent there to serve. This should never be; but it surely will be when the representatives of a people are not reasonably paid. We want men here in Congress who serve the people only, and who serve them efficiently; and in return they should receive a fair compensation. We do not want Senators and Representatives who are supported by “the interests.”

The executive department or its higher officials have greater salaries now than Senators and Representatives. The judicial department has larger salaries; and, more than that, those who fill them are taken off the billet with salaries in retirement.

Senators and Representatives do not seek, ask, or desire that they be taken care of when their days are up and weakness comes. But they have a right to take common care of themselves while serving the people whom they are to serve and whom they are in honor and duty bound to serve faithfully. What are they afraid of? The people? No. The people have intelligence and honor, and do not fear the honest opinion of those who are of them and for them.

I believe this is all that I have to say, Mr. President, except to commend the speeches which have been already made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN].

There is nothing to be said that could disparage the addresses which have been made upon the other side. There is no man in this body who has a higher respect for the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] or the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] than I. I know the work of those men, and that it is a solid and substantial work. I know the sensibilities which must actuate them on this occasion. While I share those sensibilities, and while I dislike exceedingly to be placed in a position by my public office in which I must pass upon such a question as is now presented, I must meet it in the spirit of justice to all concerned and deliver my judgment honestly and squarely according to the facts. This I have now done. On my honor as a Senator and a man I believe the salaries of Senators and Representatives should be increased that they may the better exercise their office. Accordingly I shall so vote without suspicion of myself, and not questioning the intelligent public opinion which ought to, and will, pass upon the matter.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States gives to Congress the power to increase the salaries of Members. It is not lodged anywhere else. The proposition is now made to increase the salaries. If I vote for it, I vote to increase my own salary from the 4th of March next until the 4th of March, 1909, when I shall go out of public life. Am I justified in refusing to vote, if I think that ought to be done, because some person will criticise me, because some people will say that the Senator from Colorado voted because he wanted that \$2,500 additional? Mr. President, I shall vote for this proposition upon the theory that it is right. In my twenty-seven years or more of service in this body I have never been frightened away from a vote that I believed it was my duty to cast.

Senators say that they are sensitive about increasing their own salary. Mr. President, I am not sensitive in the exercise

of any constitutional duty put upon me. I do not intend to go into any discussion, however. On two or three occasions before, when I had an opportunity, I voted to increase the salaries. I do not claim that I would not stay here if the salary is not increased. I suppose if when I came here in 1876 the salary had been \$3,000 a year I would still have been here. It has not been a question with me of salary, but it is a question with some Senators as to salary.

I do not know for certain whether we are to have a roll call, but I want to have it distinctly understood that I regard myself as discharging a duty imposed upon me by the Constitution, and I would not flinch from it if the world was to criticize me in the severest possible degree. I do not believe it will, but if it did it would make no difference in my vote.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, this is my thirty-second winter in the city of Washington. I have known almost all the men in both Houses of Congress. I do not know any of my personal acquaintances who has ever served any length of time in either House who went out of it with as much money as he went in. My distinguished and dear friend from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] has been here twenty-two years. He voiced a while ago the honest sentiment he entertained and expressed years ago, when everybody thought he was here for life, and yet I venture to say that that gentleman goes away to-day with not one-tenth of the property he had when he came here, and under such circumstances he goes away at his time of life to battle with the world for a living. I am to serve here for four years more from the 4th of next March, and, as far as I can get any assurance from the public, I would have no opposition if I chose to come back. I do not choose to come back.

But, Mr. President, in deciding this question for myself, as each man must (and I am not authorized to criticize any man for his feeling about it or his vote), I want to be put on record, and I want to vote. I shall vote for this proposition because I think it is right. I do not think, speaking for myself, that I have a right to hold myself so close to my eye that I cover four hundred and eighty-odd other gentlemen whose salaries I am voting on. I can not believe that I am "it." I am only a very small part of "it"—one four-hundred-and-eightieth of "it."

I know, Mr. President, that this is the most poorly paid body of servants in the employment of the Government. There is not a country on the face of the globe that pays its inferior and subordinate officers so high and its higher officers so low as does the United States of America. A lieutenant in the German army gets \$240 a year, and he can not marry without the consent of the colonel, and he must prove that he is able to take care of his wife and children or he can not marry at all. A telegrapher in Russia who goes to the smallest post must be able to telegraph in Russian, German, English, and French, and his stipend is \$100 a year. An English postmaster does not get \$5,000 a year for keeping a post-office, but \$1,000 is paid in England. So with all the inferior grades. I want to say that I do not believe the inferior grades of the service, I mean the lower, are paid enough here.

I do not see myself that there is the slightest delicacy in a man voting for the increased pay of all the Members of Congress because he perchance as one of them will receive an addition to his pay. The only question is this, and in my opinion it is the only one that should be considered: Is it right? Is \$5,000 a just and reasonable compensation, or is \$7,500 a more just and reasonable compensation? If any Senator here does not believe that he ought to have \$7,500, then he should vote for \$5,000. If any Senator here believes that the work calls for \$7,500, then he is at perfect liberty, in my opinion, to vote for that amount, because he believes it is right and not because his interest is affected by it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi will suspend for a moment. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 7709) to revise, codify, and amend the penal laws of the United States.

Mr. FULTON. I understand the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] desires to proceed with his speech upon the conclusion of the matter now pending, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Mississippi will proceed.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, it has been truly remarked here that a great many men sit in this Chamber whose income makes

this salary a mere bagatelle. I have myself personally known two Senators who at the end of each month handed over his check for \$416 to his private clerk. Others here will vote for this measure to whom it is nothing whatever, to whom there is not as much in one year's pay as a day's pay is to me, but they will vote for this bill because they do not believe the present salary is sufficient for the work done and the character of men to be employed.

With all deference to the rich men by whom I am surrounded, I want to say the interests of the men of this country are in the main in the keeping of men who have to toil with their hands or brains for a living for themselves and their families. It is true, exactly as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] have stated, that men would come here at a salary of two or three thousand dollars a year, and yet we must acknowledge that the compensation must justify the great class, for the talent of the country must be brought here for the administration of the public affairs of a great nation. This is a nation of 85,000,000 people; there are \$74,000,000,000 of property here; and these vast interests are put into the hands of this Senate at the last. It must pass upon every measure that comes before it, and this Chamber must work with a free hand.

Mr. President, I am perhaps the poorest man in the Senate. I do not feel ashamed of that. If I sat here a thousand years I do not suppose I would be worth a cent more than I am to-day. I would not try to be and I would not want to be. But I recollect a conversation with General Butler, when he was a Member of the House—

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. MONEY. Certainly. Excuse me; I did not see the Senator.

Mr. CARMACK. I do not want the statement of the Senator that he is the poorest man in this body to pass unchallenged. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONEY. I did not see the Senator when I made the remark. I except the Senator from Tennessee. He is just as poor as he deserves to be.

But I was about to recall that I had a conversation with General Butler in the Forty-fifth Congress. I said: "I must say that I am surprised at the readiness with which you meet every question that comes up, and how well prepared you are on everything." He said: "It is no secret particularly. I have got four extremely intelligent young men to whom I pay handsome salaries. I send those young men to ransack the libraries upon every question on the calendar in which I take an interest. They make a précis of facts; they have references to volumes, citations, and so on. They come to me with the matter already prepared. There is very little labor for me to master these things when they are prepared for me in that way." Yet how many of those here can afford to do anything of that sort? They must dig it out themselves. It is quite true, as the Senator from Arkansas has said, that the Senate in a moment, not of liberality to themselves particularly, but for the benefit of the country that its work may be properly performed, gave an allowance that goes, not to the Senator, but to his clerk and to his messenger. That messenger is what? Generally a stenographer or a man who reads books for him or something of that sort. I want to say that this assistance is not only well deserved on the part of a member, but it is the best investment of money the United States has ever made. The people of the United States are deriving more benefit from the assistance supplied by the clerks and secretaries than the Senators and Representatives themselves are receiving from them.

If I had a great business that required so many servants and men of such character, if I had an expenditure of \$750,000,000 per year, as the United States Government has, I do not think that I would get men to manage my affairs who would serve me for \$5,000 a year. What corporation in this country does not give its chief counsel from twenty-five to fifty to one hundred or one hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year? There need be no delicacy about this matter. The only thing is to act with conscientiousness. If it could be fixed to have a sliding scale of salaries so that a man who thought he was worth \$5,000 could go up and draw that much and a man who thought he was worth \$7,500 could draw that much, I suppose everybody would be willing to vote for this proposition; but we can not have a thing of that sort, Mr. President.

I for one have never felt in my life that I have been sufficiently paid for anything that I have done. Montesquieu made a remark in his Spirit of Laws that in a monarchy no gentleman ever felt that he was honored or dignified by any position

the king could give him; he was always equal to it. So I do not believe there is a man in this Chamber to-day who is not worth \$7,500 a year.

As I said, I will vote for this proposition to go into effect on the 4th of March next or on the 4th of any other March, although that is not the custom in raising salaries here. Congress has raised the salaries six different times, and in every single instance they were not in the future, but all retroactive. One was for two years, one was for four months and sixteen days, one was for six months, one was for six days, another one reduced the salaries, and that, too, was retroactive. The only trouble about that was, how in the deuce did they get back the money from the men who had drawn it? But that is the history of the change in salaries. So the salaries have been put up and put back and put up again repeatedly, and no solitary act has ever been anything except retroactive.

Now, that is not an argument in favor of retroaction, for I do not believe in it. I do not see how Congress did it; but not knowing the circumstances that environed those Congresses, respectively, I can not criticise them much. But I know this will take effect with another Congress, and that this Senate will turn out not one-third of its Members in number, but it will have nominally one-third of new membership every two years. So you would never find a time when Congress could vote this increase of salary, because they will be coming in and getting the benefit of it. But if you put it four years ahead, as proposed by the Senator from Florida, then you must calculate that the Representatives will not be there. There will not be one-third of those Representatives there in four years from to-day, and that one-third think they are entitled to vote for their successors in office.

Mr. President, for my part I want to have a roll call on this question; and I want to go on the roll as in favor of an increase of salary for those who are to come after me; and for myself I shall accept it, if the law is passed, and it will come to me without the slightest squeamishness, or I would rather say, perhaps, delicacy upon my part about it.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, I ask the Secretary to read the amendment that I intend to offer.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the proposed amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add the following proviso:

Provided, That as to the Vice-President of the United States and Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from Territories, and Resident Commissioner from Porto Rico, the compensation above provided for shall not apply for the term or terms for which either has already been elected or shall be elected in the year 1907, but it shall apply after the expiration of such terms.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, I suppose as long as one is a member of this body his votes should be cast conscientiously. If I were to follow my impulse I would stand side by side with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL], and the others who advocated the amendment as it comes from the House.

I am not opposed to the increase of salaries for Senators and Members, but the view I take of the proposition is that there is not a Senator or Member who has not sought the position he now occupies and who was not elected or appointed to that position with the express or implied understanding that he would serve for the term for which he was elected at the compensation fixed by law. I take it that, with that compensation upon the statute books, every official mentioned in the proviso I have had read sought the place, and sought it earnestly, except, as a matter of course, the presiding officer of this body, whom I would not class in the category of office seekers under any circumstances. But it seems to me that there is not a Senator or Member who is not occupying his place with an implied contract with his constituency that he will serve out his term at the salary upon the statute books at the time he was elected.

There has not been a Senator elected this winter, there was not a Representative elected in the month of November, there will not be a Senator elected during the year 1907, and there are but two or three, I understand, yet to be elected, who will not be in the office or who will not be seeking the office with an implied promise to his constituency that he does not seek or desire and will not vote to increase his salary.

It is true, Mr. President, that when the law will go into effect (for doubtless it will be passed by a decided majority of this body) I will not be one of the beneficiaries. If I was I would vote and speak against it the more earnestly. But I do not feel that I have any greater right to vote to increase the salary of those who I believe or hold to have an implied agreement with the country to serve for a specified time at a specified sum than I have to increase my own salary. I do not disagree with those

who maintain that the present salary is not sufficient to afford to those who receive it such a comfortable living as gentlemen of the character who occupy these positions are entitled to have. I do not believe that there is a Senator or Member in the present Congress who has not come here at a considerable financial sacrifice. If he is a lawyer, he must sacrifice many professional fees. If he is a business man, he can find no one who will give the same attention to his business as he is able to give to it himself. If he is at the head of a manufacturing establishment or a great commercial body, he must necessarily sacrifice during at least a year of each Congress interests of vast importance to him and that no one else can serve as he did and could.

But, Mr. President, these positions were sought with a knowledge of these facts. The honor and the dignity of a position in either House, I have no doubt, they felt were ample consideration for the sacrifices they would make in taking positions in either the one or the other body. Under those circumstances, Mr. President, it seems to me, however others may feel—and I make no issue with those who feel or speak to the contrary—it seems to me that the obligation, the implied agreement, between the candidates and their constituencies when selection was made should not be broken for the sake of the comparatively small increase of salary that this amendment will bring. I say comparatively small increase of salary, for I do not believe that the \$2,500 per annum would deter a single Representative or a single Senator from seeking to acquire the position in the first place or to maintain it after it has been acquired.

Nor do I believe, Mr. President, that the failure to adopt the amendment that comes here from the House of Representatives would deter any Senator or Member of the other House from seeking to retain the position which he now has. It is in reality a small matter to this great Government. The matter of a million dollars for two, three, four, or five years will not be felt in the billion dollars that is now annually appropriated for carrying on the affairs of the Government. It is not the sum that is involved, Mr. President, that I flinch at; it is a mere bagatelle; but why I hesitate to vote for the amendment is because I believe there is an implied agreement that should not be ignored and which I do not feel at liberty to ignore.

This question was up, I think, about four years ago. It was then claimed by some of my constituents that the vote I gave prevented the adoption of such an amendment as this, a provision that increased the salaries of Senators and Representatives to the sum of \$7,500 a year. The reason that vote was given is the reason which impels me to offer the amendment which I have read. There was no opportunity to cast a vote at that time directly upon that proposition; but the motive that impelled me to cast the vote was that I did not feel that I had a right to vote to raise my own salary or to raise the salary of any other Senator or Member of the House of Representatives. Then, as now, I was entirely willing that an amendment should be adopted, or a law passed, that would increase the salaries of Senators and Members of the other House, as new Senators and new Members would be elected after the law had gone into effect.

I regret, Mr. President, that I am unable to vote for the amendment which comes from the other House. It will give me great pleasure to vote for the amendment if it shall be amended either as is proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY] or as it is proposed to be amended by the amendment which I shall offer, for \$7,500 is not too much, although \$5,000 is quite ample, in view of the honor and dignity of the position which the amendment affects, to bring to these bodies the very best talent of the country and men of the highest character and most admirable ambition.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I have desisted from saying anything on the pending proposition, and I shall not say anything upon it during the discussion. It had been announced that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] would make a speech to-day, and I supposed when we began the discussion and consideration of the bill that it would probably be ended inside of an hour or two. I am very anxious that we shall come to a vote on the bill as soon as possible, so that the Senator from Indiana may take the floor.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to occupy more than a moment of the Senate's time, even if I were not restrained because of the fact that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] desires to speak, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] has just stated.

Mr. President, it does not lie in my mouth to criticise the word or act of any other Senator, and I do not intend to do so by what I am about to say. This is a question that every man must determine for himself from his own point of view. I believe the salary now provided for Senators and Representatives is inadequate; but I can not, from my point of view, vote to in-

crease the salary during the term for which I have been elected. If an amendment could be adopted that would put the operation of the law increasing salaries beyond the terms of Senators and Representatives now elected, I should support it, but not otherwise. As the matter now stands, I shall feel myself constrained to vote for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], and if that be not agreed to, then to vote against the entire proposition.

Mr. WARREN. I desire to ask the Senator from Missouri a question. He admits that the present pay of Senators and Representatives is inadequate, but declines to be in a position where he votes to raise his own pay. It seems to me that it is within the power of every Senator to be perfectly at ease with his own conscience and with his constituents, for if the salary is increased and he declines to vote for such increase, and he prefers to receive for himself the same salary as now—the same salary as when he was elected—he can refuse to draw the increase and can make the people understand his position in that way. It seems to me that would be a perfectly safe way out of the matter, as it is a matter between a Senator and his constituency and between a Senator and his own individual conscience.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, what I might do or some other Senator might do in such a contingency is not important. It does not affect the question of right or propriety involved in the pending proposition. That is all I care to say, Mr. President.

Mr. McCREARY. Mr. President, I did not expect to participate in this debate on the salary question; but as it seems probable, from the many advocates of the pending amendment of the House of Representatives, that there may not be a call of the yeas and nays, I think it is proper and just to myself to say that I am not in favor of increasing the salaries of Senators and Representatives. I shall vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], and if that is not adopted I shall vote against the amendment proposed by the House of Representatives increasing the salaries of Senators and Representatives to \$7,500 per annum. I am in favor of allowing the salaries of Senators and Representatives to remain as now fixed by law, at \$5,000 per annum.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] to the amendment of the House of Representatives.

Mr. NELSON. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MALLORY. I should like to have the amendment of the House of Representatives read as it would read if the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota be adopted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment of the House of Representatives as it would stand if the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota be adopted.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the amendment of the House of Representatives, after the word "each," by striking out the words:

and the compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Porto Rico shall be at the rate of \$7,500 per annum each.

So that, if amended, it will read:

That on and after March 4, 1907, the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Vice-President of the United States, and the heads of Executive Departments who are members of the President's Cabinet, shall be at the rate of \$12,000 per annum each.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I do not desire to say anything at this time upon the main proposition, but as to this amendment I want to say a word.

However I may vote on the main proposition I am certainly opposed to this amendment. As I have previously stated on the floor of the Senate, so long as the standard of compensation of Senators and Representatives remains as it is, I will recognize that as the correct interpretation on the part of Congress of what should be the standard of compensation and I will never vote for the increase of the salary of any other officer of the Government. The only exception I make to that is the case of the Vice-President.

I think the compensation of the Vice-President is disgracefully low. I think the compensation of the Vice-President should be at least \$25,000 a year. I have served in the Senate during the Administrations of three different Presidents and of four different Vice-Presidents, and my deliberate judgment, from such observation as I have been able to make, is that the expenses of the Vice-President are larger than the expenses of the President of the United States. I think the Vice-President expends more money by reason of his office—and I am not speaking of this particular Vice-President, but of the four under whom I have served—the Vice-President expends more money by reason of his official position than does the President of the United States. It is very natural that such should be the

case, because of his more intimate and wider association with official life than the President of the United States has, except in a very long-distance manner.

So I make that exception, and I would be very glad to vote for that; but as to saying that, while we recognize \$5,000 as a correct compensation for a Senator and a Representative, the head of a Department should have \$12,000 is ridiculous to my mind, and I would never vote for it under any circumstances. I do not say this in regard to the merits or the demerits of the main proposition, but I want the reason stated why I shall most certainly vote against the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. I think everybody else should properly vote the same way.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, in view of the remarks of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] about the inadequacy of the compensation of the Vice-President of the United States, I desire to say that the amendment I offered was based upon the proposition that the salary of no official who is elected for a specific term should be raised during that term. In many of the States of the Union there are constitutional provisions against the increase of compensation to any official during his term of office. It is so in my State, and I regard that constitutional inhibition as a wise and a proper one. If it were a proposition to increase the salary of the Vice-President to \$20,000 or \$25,000 a year, pure and simple, to make that the compensation for that high official, I would vote to do so with the greatest cheerfulness, provided I could do so without infringing the principle upon which my amendment is based. Under the circumstances, or, at least, in view of the suggestion made by the Senator from Georgia, I thought it was due that I should say this.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask for a vote.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], on which the yeas and nays are demanded. Is there a second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BURROWS. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will again state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota.

The SECRETARY. In the amendment of the House of Representatives it is proposed to strike out the following words:

and the compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Porto Rico shall be at the rate of \$7,500 per annum each.

Mr. FORAKER. I did not understand that that was the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending amendment is the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WARREN. As the amendment was read it sounded as if the salaries were fixed at \$7,500. Surely that is not the purpose of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BERRY. The Senator from Minnesota moves to strike that out.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CULLOM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN]. I understand from his colleague [Mr. DANIEL] that I have a right to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. DANIEL (when Mr. MARTIN's name was called). I desire to say that if my colleague [Mr. MARTIN] were present, he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ALLISON. I am paired generally with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN]. I do not know how he would vote on this question; but if he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. NEWLANDS. I am paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GAMBLE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], and vote. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—17.

Berry	Culberson	Nelson	Tallaferro
Blackburn	Frazier	Patterson	Whyte
Burkett	Hansbrough	Perkins	
Carmack	McCreary	Rayner	
Clay	Mallory	Stone	

NAYS—56.

Aldrich	Clark, Mont.	Foraker	La Follette
Allee	Clark, Wyo.	Foster	Latimer
Ankeny	Clarke, Ark.	Frye	Lodge
Bacon	Crane	Fulton	Long
Benson	Cullom	Gallinger	McCumber
Beveridge	Daniel	Hale	McEnery
Brandegee	Dick	Heyburn	Millard
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Hopkins	Money
Burnham	Dubois	Kean	Newlands
Burrows	Du Pont	Kittredge	Nixon
Carter	Flint	Knox	Overman

Penrose
Pettus
Piles

Scott
Simmons
Smoot

Spooner
Sutherland
Teller

Tillman
Warner
Warren

NOT VOTING—17.

Alger
Allison
Bailey
Clapp
Depew

Dolliver
Dryden
Elkins
Gamble
Gearin

Hemenway
McLaurin
Martin
Morgan
Platt

Proctor
Wetmore

So Mr. NELSON's amendment to the amendment of the House of Representatives was rejected.

Mr. MALLORY. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In the amendment of the House of Representatives it is proposed to strike out the words "nineteen hundred and seven" and insert in lieu thereof the words "nineteen hundred and thirteen;" so that, if amended, it will read:

That on and after March 4, 1913, the compensation shall be, etc.

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President, I think the amendment of the House of Representatives is right, and, in order to illustrate it, I will take the privilege of speaking of my colleague [Mr. MORGAN].

He began his education at the old field school. He has always been a student from boyhood. I knew him when he first became a lawyer, and I have known him ever since. I have lived in the same village with him for about sixty years.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Alabama commenced life without anything. You have all seen how hard he works here. He has worked that way all his life. I have been his associate and adversary for over sixty years. He has always been a hard-working man. He commenced life working, and he has been at it ever since. When he came to the Senate his income was something in the neighborhood of \$15,000 a year. He came to the Senate in moderate circumstances. He had acquired some property. He owned a good dwelling house at Selma, and he owned a good plantation. He has been here now for thirty years. Had he worked at his profession I have no doubt in the world that, on an average, during the time he has been in the Senate his income would have been at least \$20,000 a year.

I will not particularly speak of his work here, but I presume it has been as constant and laborious as that which any Senator in this body has ever performed. Senators may say he elected to do that. Certainly he did. But the question is, after having increased the salary of nearly every other officer under the Government, and in view of the fact that there is nobody else who can raise our salaries but the body to which we are attached, shall we be denied some reasonable increase—not full compensation, but some reasonable increase in our salaries?

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Alabama came here in moderate circumstances, and he is in very moderate circumstances to-day. Shall he deny himself the right to a little more adequate compensation? He has had none. His estate is worth only about as much to-day as it was when he came here, and to tell the truth, Mr. President, our people are proud that he is worth no more. It may be a singular sort of thing, but they are proud of him because he has not become rich.

I merely picked out that instance by way of illustration. I do not mean to say there are not various other Senators in the same situation, but I mean to say here is one of the hardest-working lawyers in the United States who might have been a millionaire to-day if he had stuck to his profession. There are other instances of the same sort. I speak of this because I know the facts, and I am not so familiar with the lives of other Senators as I am with his.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY].

Mr. MALLORY. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. SPOONER. Let it be stated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will again be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out the words "nineteen hundred and seven" and insert in lieu thereof the words "nineteen hundred and thirteen;" so that if amended the amendment will read:

That on and after March 4, 1913, the compensation of the Speaker of the House, etc.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment which has been stated, on which the yeas and nays are demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NEWLANDS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GAMBLE]. I transfer

the pair to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. DANIEL (when Mr. MARTIN's name was called). I beg to state that the Senator from Virginia, if present, would vote "nay."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I should have stated on the last vote that I have a general pair with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP].

Mr. CLAPP rose.

Mr. SIMMONS. But he has released me from the pair. I will vote "nay." I did not know he was present.

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 14, nays 61, as follows:

YEAS—14.

Berry
Blackburn
Carmack
Culberson

Hansbrough
La Follette
Mallory
Nelson

Patterson
Perkins
Rayner
Stone

Taliaferro
Whyte

NAYS—61.

Aldrich
Allee
Allison
Ankeny
Bacon
Benson
Beveridge
Brandegee
Bulkeley
Burkett
Burnham
Burrows
Carter
Clapp
Clark, Mont.
Clark, Wyo.

Clarke, Ark.
Clay
Crane
Cullom
Daniel
Dick
Dillingham
Dubois
Du Pont
Flint
Foraker
Foster
Frazier
Frye
Fulton
Gallinger

Hale
Hemenway
Heyburn
Hopkins
Kean
Kittredge
Knox
Latimer
Lodge
Long
McCreary
McCumber
McEnery
Millard
Newlands
Nixon

Overman
Penrose
Pettus
Piles
Scott
Simmons
Smoot
Spooner
Sutherland
Teller
Tillman
Warner
Warren

NOT VOTING—15.

Alger
Bailey
Depew
Dolliver

Dryden
Elkins
Gamble
Gearin

McLaurin
Martin
Money
Morgan

Platt
Proctor
Wetmore

So Mr. MALLORY's amendment was rejected.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON], which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the amendment the following proviso:

Provided, That as to the Vice-President of the United States and Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from Territories, and Resident Commissioner from Porto Rico, the compensation above provided for shall not apply for the term or terms for which either has already been elected, or shall be elected in the year 1907; but it shall apply after the expiration of such terms.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, the sentiment seems to be so pronounced upon this proposition that I desire to consume no further time of the Senate, and therefore withdraw the amendment, although it expresses my own conviction.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment is withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BERRY. Let us have the yeas and nays.

Mr. SPOONER. On that question I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLISON (when his name was called). I have a general pair, as I stated a moment ago, with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN]. I do not know how he would vote on this question. Therefore I refrain from voting. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. DANIEL (when Mr. MARTIN's name was called). I will state that if my colleague [Mr. MARTIN] were here, he would vote "yea," but on this vote he stands paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON].

Mr. NEWLANDS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GAMBLE] to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. DANIEL. That there may be no misunderstanding, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON] is now released and can vote. I announced a pair between the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Colorado. It can stand as the Senator from Nevada has stated it, the Senator from Virginia being paired on this vote with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GAMBLE], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON] may vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ALLISON. I will state that my colleague [Mr. DOLLIVER] is necessarily absent. I am not advised how he would vote on this question.

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 21, as follows:

YEAS—53.

Aldrich	Cullom	Hopkins	Pettus
Allee	Daniel	Kittredge	Piles
Ankeny	Dick	Knox	Scott
Benson	Dillingham	Latimer	Simmons
Beveridge	Dubois	Lodge	Smoot
Brandeggee	Du Pont	Long	Spooner
Bulkeley	Flint	McCumber	Sutherland
Burnham	Foraker	McNery	Teller
Burrows	Foster	Millard	Tillman
Carter	Frye	Money	Warner
Clark, Mont.	Fulton	Newlands	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Nixon	
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	Overman	
Crane	Heyburn	Penrose	

NAYS—21.

Bacon	Clay	McCreary	Stone
Berry	Culberson	Mallory	Taliaferro
Blackburn	Frazier	Nelson	Whyte
Burkett	Hansbrough	Patterson	
Carmack	Hemenway	Perkins	
Clapp	La Follette	Rayner	

NOT VOTING—16.

Alger	Dolliver	Gearin	Morgan
Allison	Dryden	Kean	Platt
Bailey	Elkins	McLaurin	Proctor
Depew	Gamble	Martin	Wetmore

So the amendment was concurred in.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate insist upon its other amendments and agree to the conference asked for by the House of Representatives, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT appointed as the conferees on the part of the Senate Mr. CULLOM, Mr. WARREN, and Mr. TELLER.

DISMISSAL OF THREE COMPANIES OF TWENTY-FIFTH INFANTRY.

Mr. FORAKER. I move that Senate Document 155, first and second parts, which has been ordered printed and is lying on the table, be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs for consideration.

The motion was agreed to.

EMPLOYMENT OF CHILD LABOR IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the bill (H. R. 17838) to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the bill indicated by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I think, Mr. President, that the Senate and the country are to be congratulated that a period has been reached in the Brownsville discussion. Nearly if not more than half of the time of this session has been taken, very properly, no doubt, in the discussion of facts and constitutional questions in that great controversy; and now that we are through with it, so far as taking the time of the Senate is concerned—and, as I have said before, it was most properly taken and was most valuable to the whole country—and now that we have voted ourselves an increase of salary, perhaps it is proper to call the attention of the Senate to some other matters of almost as much importance to the nation.

We can profitably use the remainder of the session in dealing with other great questions of nearly equal consequence. It is to call the attention of this body and of the country to what I deem, and think that I shall be able to show, is one of the gravest conditions which confronts this Republic that I have risen this afternoon to speak. I refer, Mr. President, to the condition of the employment of young children in the factories, the mines, and the sweat shops of this country. I mean to call attention to precisely what it means both to these children and to the future of the nation.

I do this upon an amendment which I have offered to the bill to regulate child labor in the District of Columbia. This latter bill, upon which there has been a tacit agreement to vote, is an admirable measure, and I shall of course support it. And yet, in comparison with the general evil, it is trivial, because in Washington less than in any other spot in this country does the vice, and as I shall be able to show, the crime of child labor exist.

It is here no doubt, but it is here in such inconsiderable quantity that in comparison with the great national evil it is not worthy of attention.

Therefore, Mr. President, I have offered as an amendment to the District of Columbia child-labor bill the bill which I offered early in the session, to provide a national method for stopping this distinctly national evil.

And in order that my time may not be consumed, in view of the fact that I have begun to address the Senate at a late hour, I will ask permission, instead of having the bill read at this

juncture, that it may be inserted in my remarks.

Briefly, however, I may state to Senators who may want to follow this discussion that the amendment provides for the prohibition of interstate commerce in the products of factories and mines where children under 14 years of age are employed; and it provides appropriate penalties for the violation of its provisions. This brief statement of the bill, its purposes, and its methods will be sufficient to bring to the attention of the Senate a discussion both of the facts which describe the evil that it is intended to cure and of the law as to its constitutionality and legality.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

The amendment referred to is as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BEVERIDGE to the bill (H. R. 17838) to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia, viz: On page 12, after line 20, insert the following:

SEC. 11. That six months from and after the passage of this act no carrier of interstate commerce shall transport or accept for transportation, from one State or Territory to any other State or Territory or to the District of Columbia or within any Territory, the products of any factory or mine in which children under 14 years of age are employed or permitted to work, which products are offered to said interstate carrier by the firm, person, or corporation owning or operating said factory or mine, or any officer or agent or servant thereof, for transportation from one State or Territory to any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia or within any Territory.

SEC. 12. That no carrier of interstate commerce shall transport or accept for transportation, from one State or Territory to any other State or Territory or to the District of Columbia or within any Territory, the products of any factory or mine offered it for transportation by any person, firm, or corporation which owns or operates such factory or mine, or any officer, agent, or servant of such person, firm, or corporation, until the president or secretary or general manager of such corporation or a member of such firm or the person owning or operating such factory or mine shall file with said carrier an affidavit to the effect that children under 14 years of age are not employed in such factory or mine.

SEC. 13. That the form of said affidavit shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor. After the first affidavit is filed a like affidavit shall be filed, on or before July 1 and on or before December 31 of each year, with the interstate carrier to which such factory or mine offers its products for transportation; and after the first affidavit subsequent affidavits shall also state that no children under 14 years of age are employed or permitted to work in said factory or mine or have been employed or permitted to work in said factory or mine at any time during the preceding six months.

SEC. 14. That any officer or agent of a carrier of interstate commerce who is a party to any violation of sections 11, 12, or 13 of this act, or who violates any of the provisions of sections 11, 12, or 13 of this act, shall be punished for each offense by a fine of not more than \$10,000 nor less than \$1,000, or by imprisonment for not more than six months nor less than one month, or by both said fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court. Any person by sections 11, 12, or 13 of this act required to file the affidavit therein provided for who fails or refuses to file such affidavit, or who shall make a false statement in said affidavit, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$20,000 nor less than \$5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year nor less than three months, or by both said fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia and to prohibit the transportation by carriers of interstate commerce of the products of mines and factories employing child labor."

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, the prevalence of these evils, I think, is hardly understood by the Senate. That is most natural, and I am not blaming any Senator or any Member of the House for not understanding the widespread and desperate character of this evil. We have all of us been busy—every man of us—with great questions and large duties which tax our time, and it is not to be supposed, therefore, that we would know as well as perhaps the people of the country themselves know, how far-reaching is this evil and how dreadful is its character. Therefore, I shall take up at the beginning some time in describing it.

THE CENSUS.

I have been asked for the census figures. I suppose that, little as all of us know about the matter, we are all familiar with the census figures. The census figures are bad enough, but I shall be able to demonstrate that they are far below the truth.

According to the census of 1900, there are not far from two million children in the United States under 16 years of age working in "gainful occupations."

Of these, according to the census of 1900, nearly seven hundred thousand are employed in industries other than agricultural.

This bill does not strike at the employment of children engaged in agriculture. I do not for a moment pretend that working children on the farm is bad for them.

I think it is the universal experience that where children are employed within their strength and in the open air there can be no better training. All educators have now come to an agreement that the technical schools and the manual training schools in our cities are by far the best features of our educational system.

And I am in favor of and look forward to the time when, as a part of the educational system of this country, children will

be taught to work. For, I repeat, there is no training like labor.

But, Mr. President, the evil at which this bill strikes is not such labor. I may say, and truthfully say, that this bill does not strike at such labor at all. It strikes at child toil, and I will emphasize it still more in saying that it strikes at child slavery in the mines, the factories, and the sweat shops of the nation. That is all this bill strikes at.

CENSUS FIGURES TOO LOW.

Mr. President, I said a moment ago that the census figures, appalling as they are, are notoriously inadequate. Two million children under 16 years of age is bad enough; *seven hundred thousand in factories, mills, and sweat shops is bad enough*; but there is not a man or woman who has investigated this question who does not know that only a part of the children so employed were returned by the census enumerators, and I shall show before I am through why that is.

But let me give to the Senate some illustrations of the inadequacy of the census figures. For example, the census of 1900 gives Maryland as having something over 5,000 children at work. The census bulletins of 1905 give 5,553 under 16 at work in Maryland, of which 3,666 were in Baltimore.

Very well. In 1906 the Maryland law was amended, requiring children under 16 to secure permits testifying to physical and educational requirements. The law has been in force about five months and a half, and already *more than 11,000 permits have been granted* and between 1,200 and 1,500 refused; so we see that in the State of Maryland the census of 1900 is by the record 100 per cent below the truth.

Then again, the census bulletin in 1905, that is even later than 1900, gives the number of males in cotton mills in North Carolina at 31,231. The labor commissioner of North Carolina gives 44,222 operatives, which would make 52,025 for all the mills in the same ratio.

Again, it is estimated and given, I think, by the census of 1900 that the total of children employed in Southern cotton mills, as, for example, in North Carolina, South Carolina, Alabama, and Georgia, is something under 30,000.

Yet the testimony of those who have investigated the conditions upon the ground and who have not taken the returns of manufacturers who have children in their employ is that the lowest possible estimate, excluding every possible fraction of children who were questionable, numbers at least 60,000.

So, Mr. President, we see that the census, bad as that is—terrible as it is—is totally inaccurate. Anybody who has studied this question knows why it is inaccurate.

False certificates, which are universal; the hiding of children when the factory inspector comes; the reliance of the census enumerator upon reports of interested parties; all these very naturally acted to give only a fraction of this terrible truth.

Again, at that time the attention of the country had not been called to this evil. It is the conservative testimony of men and women who have given years of investigation to this subject that there are to-day in this country not less than 2,000,000 children at work, of whom more than half a million are employed in factories, mines, and sweat shops. I quote from Mr. Spargo, who is perhaps as accurate an authority upon this subject as anyone. Says Mr. Spargo:

I am convinced that the number of children under 15 years of age who work is much larger than the official figures give, notwithstanding that these are supposed to give the number of all workers under 16 years of age. It would, I think, be quite within the mark to say that the number of child workers under 15 is at least 2,250,000.

So, Mr. President, I suppose it is clear to everyone that we can see that the census figures are much below the truth.

I suppose we may say, putting it upon a conservative basis, that as I speak to you there are now not less than 1,000,000 children under 16 years of age (and I shall show by sworn testimony that some of them are five and six and seven years of age) at work in the coal mines, in factories, and in the sweat shops of this nation.

These are figures, Mr. President; but figures give no idea of what this means. Of course no Senator here would permit his boy or girl under 16 to work in a coal breaker or in a sweat-shop or a factory. But it is not the children of Senators who are involved; it is the children of the people.

ALL STATEMENTS SWORN TO.

Yet if I were merely to say that so many children were employed, that would give no idea of what this evil is. Figures can not, of course, describe it. Figures only give you an idea of its extent. I propose now to describe it. I propose to show to the Senate and the country precisely what it means, and I shall do this by the description of these children at work, of how their work is conducted, of its effect upon them, and in each instance

by the testimony of eyewitnesses who have personally investigated this matter.

And, Mr. President, I shall not give a single statement here to-day that is not now supported by an affidavit, or will not be almost immediately. For I am perfectly well aware that no statement which is made in the description of this evil will go unchallenged. Therefore, instead of stating facts by merely reading an article and letting the statement go at that, as is our custom when debating amongst each other, I have resolved to support each of the incidents which I shall give by the sworn testimony of the man or the woman who gives it.

Then if any of the great cotton factories, South and North, if any of the mining interests in Pennsylvania or elsewhere, if any of the railroad systems, if any of the owners of glass factories think that they have been injured by these statements, they will have an opportunity to question men and women who are willing to stand that test of having made affidavit to the truth of all they state.

The course of this argument will be merely this: First, to state the facts.

Then to state, as well as I can, the entire legality of the remedy I propose.

For if the facts convince the Senate that this is a national evil of such a crying nature that it ought to be cured; and if I can show that the method I propose is within the power of Congress, of course the conclusion is that the law must be enacted.

THE EVIDENCE OF CHILD LABOR.

Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have read the following affidavit.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

AFFIDAVIT OF JOHN SPARGO.

CITY OF YONKERS, County of Westchester, N. Y.

John Spargo, of said city and county, being duly sworn, deposes that he is the author of the book entitled "The Blister Cry of the Children," of which the Macmillan Company, New York City, are the publishers and owners of copyright. Deponent swears that the instances, occurrences, and conversations given as illustrations or examples in the section of the aforesaid published work which bears the chapter title "The working child," so far as he states that they were witnessed, heard, or examined by himself in person, were so witnessed or heard or examined by himself in person, and that each one of the same is true.

Deponent further saith that the greater part of the section of the book in question being composed of documentary evidence and inferences therefrom which said deponent believeth to be reasonable and fair, a list of authorities for each and all the citations made and incorporated into the argument of the chapter aforesaid is contained on pages 314 to 319, inclusive; and that after careful expert investigation he truly believes that the statements so specified are each and every one substantially true, containing no material errors.

JOHN SPARGO.

HARTFORD, January 21, 1907.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT, Hartford County, ss:

Personally appeared before me, a notary public, John Spargo, and made oath to the foregoing affidavit.

EDWARD S. STEELE, Notary Public.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Now, before I go on I want to say that the examples which I am giving are by no means the worst ones. I do not propose to refer to what can be referred to and proved unless the indifference of the Senate compels it—such, for example, as the pouring of cold water on little children to keep them awake after they have worked standing on their feet ten hours.

Furthermore, in reading what is sworn to in each one of these affidavits, I have carefully excluded everything that might be called the "excited sentimentality" of the writers; "excited" by the horrible things which they witnessed themselves. Also I shall confine the statements that I am going to read to the Senate to such as are typical—not the worst nor the best, but such as are typical—every one of which I will support by affidavits and further proof if anyone questions those statements.

Mr. Spargo gives the following example:

During the Philadelphia textile workers' strike in 1903 I saw at least a score of children ranging from 8 to 10 years of age who had been working in the mills prior to the strike.

Ten years of age, working in the mills prior to the strike, 9 years old in Pennsylvania, in Philadelphia, where the law limit is 14 years, and at the lowest for such work as that for the last seven years, 13 years. Mr. Spargo goes on:

One little girl of 9 I saw in Kensington Labor Lyceum. She had been working for almost a year.

That is, she had been working at 8.

Before the strike began, she said, and a "careful inquiry" proved her story to be true.

Here is another example. This is from Paterson, N. J.:

At 6 o'clock the whistles shrieked and the streets were suddenly filled with people, many of them mere children. Of all the crowd of

tired, pallid, and languid looking children I could only get speech with one, a little girl who claimed 13 years, though she was smaller than many a child of 10.

Indeed, as I think of her now, I doubt whether she would have come up to the standard of normal physical development either in weight or stature for a child of 10.

One learns, however, not to judge the ages of working children by their physical appearance, for they are usually behind other children in height, weight, and girth of chest, often as much as two or three years.

I shall insert in my remarks at the proper place the difference in height, amounting in some instances to as much as 4 inches, between men and women who have worked as children and those who have not worked as children. Says Mr. Spargo:

If my little Paterson friend was 13, perhaps the nature of her employment will explain her puny, stunted body. She works in the "steaming room" of the flax mill.

I do not think that you will find in this, as we go along, any particular materials for amusement; Senators seem to think it very funny. Mr. Spargo continues:

All day long, in a room filled with clouds of steam, she has to stand barefooted in pools of water twisting coils of wet hemp. When I saw her she was dripping wet, though she said that she had worn a rubber apron all day. In the coldest evenings of winter little Marie and hundreds of other little girls must go out from the superheated steaming rooms into the bitter cold in just that condition.

To that statement Mr. Spargo makes affidavit.

Here is the description of the labor of children in a certain kind of glass factory. He describes how he went to this factory and goes on as follows:

CHILD LABOR IN GLASS FACTORIES.

It was a big wooden structure, so loosely built that it afforded little protection from drafts, and surrounded by a high fence with several rows of barbed wire stretched across the top. I went with the foreman of the factory and he explained to me the reason for the stockade-like fence.

"It keeps the young lumps inside once we've got 'em for the night shift," he said.

The "young lumps" were, of course, the boys employed, about forty in number, at least ten of whom were less than 12 years of age.

It was a cheap bottle factory, and the proportion of boys to men was larger than is usual in the higher grades of manufacture. Cheapness and child labor go together—the cheaper the grade of manufacture, as a rule, the cheaper the labor employed.

The hours of labor for "the night shift" were from 5.30 p. m. to 3.30 a. m.

I stayed and watched the boys at their work for several hours, and when their tasks were done saw them disappear into the darkness and storm of the night.

Now, he describes—and I suppose it is of some concern to the Senate of the United States to know what kind of citizens we are going to have in the future—

In the middle of the room was a large—

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator state where the factory was?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do not know whether he states where the factory was. He says:

I shall never forget my first visit to a glass factory at night.

Mr. GALLINGER. He does not state where?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; but he makes affidavit to the effect that he personally examined this and it was true. Wherever he gives the location, of course I shall give it. However, I wish to stop right here and say that I will give other descriptions of these glass factories, almost identical with the breakers and of work of boys in the breakers, and a great many more of the cotton mills of the South.

And if the Senate is not convinced by this mass of testimony, I shall present more—much more. For I warn the enemies of this reform that this testimony will be only the beginning if more is found necessary.

And I shall show precisely what children do in these mills and mines and sweatshops, and precisely what effect it has on them. In each instance where the author gives the place I shall give it, and in each instance I shall present the affidavit or state it in substance or why I do not give it.

Here is Mr. Spargo's description of a glass factory:

In the middle of the room was a large round furnace with a number of small doors, 3 or 4 feet from the ground, forming a sort of belt around the furnace. In front of these doors the glass blowers were working.

Then he describes the labor of glass blowers:

Then began the work of the boys. By the side of each mold sat a "take-out boy," who, with tongs, took the half-finished bottles—not yet provided with necks—out of the molds. Then other boys, called "snapper-ups," took these bodies of bottles in their tongs and put the small ends into gas-heated molds till they were red hot.

Then the boys took them out with almost incredible quickness and passed them to other men—"finishers"—who shaped the necks of the bottles into their final form.

Then the "carrying-in boys," sometimes called "carrier pigeons,"

took the red-hot bottles from the benches, three or four at a time, upon big asbestos shovels to the annealing oven, where they are gradually cooled off to insure even contraction and to prevent breaking in consequence of too rapid cooling.

The work of these "carrying-in boys," several of whom were less than 12 years old, was by far the hardest of all. They were kept on a slow run all the time from the benches to the annealing oven and back again.

The distance to the annealing oven in the factory in question was 100 feet, and the boys made seventy-two trips per hour, making the distance traveled in eight hours nearly 22 miles. Over half of this distance the boys were carrying their hot loads to the oven. The pay of these boys varies from 60 cents to a dollar for eight hours' work.

A continued uninterrupted "trot"—that is the term they use for it—without rest, without cessation, without relaxation of nerve or muscle in the superheated atmosphere of the factory.

But listen to Mr. Spargo:

About a year ago I gathered particulars of the pay of 257 boys in New Jersey and Pennsylvania: the lowest pay was 40 cents per night and the highest \$1.10, while the average was 72 cents.

Before I leave the subject of glass factories I wish to read a description of the investigation of the glass factory at Alton, Ill. I think it was by Mrs. Florence Kelley. Florence Kelley will be known, I think, to most, at least, of the older Senators here. She is the daughter of Congressman William D. Kelley, who was so long a prominent Member of the other House. She is a very earnest worker in the reform of child-labor laws, and I think it is probably due to her as much as to anybody else that the Illinois child-labor law, which is now perhaps the most perfect child-labor law in the United States, was passed.

Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have read the following affidavit.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

AFFIDAVIT OF FLORENCE KELLEY.

I hereby certify that the statements contained in my book entitled "Some Ethical Gains Through Legislation," published by the Macmillan Company, are correct, except so far as certain State laws have been enacted or amended since the publication of the volume in November, 1905.

FLORENCE KELLEY.

Sworn to before me this 25th day of January, 1907.

[SEAL.]

WILLIAM J. DOHERTY,

No. 114, Notary Public, Kings County.

(Certificate filed in New York County.)

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mrs. Kelley says:

The earnings of the glass-bottle blowers depend somewhat upon the speed of the boys who fetch and carry for them. These lads are therefore kept trotting at the highest speed which a child can maintain for several hours.

In making inspections of the glass-bottle works the writer found it impossible to get from a boy a consecutive statement as to his name, address, or parentage.

A boy would say, "My name is Jimmie," and then trot to the cooling oven with his load of bottles and returning say, in answer to a fresh question, "I live in a shanty boat," then trot to the molder for another set of bottles and returning say, "I'm going to be 8 next summer," and so on.

Among twenty-four lads questioned during one night inspection not one ventured to pause long enough to put together two of the foregoing statements.

And the eye of the boy interrupted in his work was always fastened anxiously upon the blower for whom he was working.

The blower did not pay the boy, who was carried on the pay rolls of the company; but when a boy was detained for the purpose of questioning a shrill whistle sounded and the boy would say to the inspector, "Don't you hear him doggin' me?"

Mr. HOPKINS. The inspection which the Senator from Indiana has just described was made before the passage of the present law to which he refers, I presume.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; that was when Mrs. Kelley was trying to get the present law passed. That inspection was prior to the passage of the Illinois law; but I will say to the Senator from Illinois that I shall present an affidavit of a woman—I think the Senator knows her very well—relative to that very subject, in which she states that the law, excellent as it is, is violated now in that very town.

CHILD LABOR IN THE COAL "BREAKERS."

Now, Mr. President, I wish to leave the glass factories, so far as Mr. Spargo is concerned, in order to save time. I intend to take them up in their order and shall take each up at the proper time. I have given some figures about the work of children in the Pennsylvania mines. Here is what Mr. Spargo, who personally investigated this thing, says about that. I think I had better give it now:

According to the census of 1900, there were 25,000 boys under 16 years of age employed in and around the mines and quarries of the United States. In the State of Pennsylvania alone—the State which enslaves more children than any other—there are thousands of little "breaker boys" employed, many of them not more than 9 or 10 years old.

The law forbids the employment of children under 14, and the records of the mines generally show that the law is "obeyed."

Yet, in May, 1905, an investigation by the national child labor committee showed that in one small borough of 7,000 population

among the boys employed in breakers 35 were 9 years old, 40 were 10, 45 were 11, and 45 were 12—over 150 boys illegally employed in one section of boy labor in one small town!

During the anthracite coal strike of 1902 I attended the Labor Day demonstration at Pittston and witnessed the parade of another at Wilkes-Barre. In each case there were hundreds of boys marching, all of them wearing their "working buttons," testifying to the fact that they were bona fide workers. Scores of them were less than 10 years of age; others were 11 or 12.

He describes the work these boys were doing, and I shall have several witnesses on that.

Work in the coal breakers is exceedingly hard and dangerous. Crouched over the chutes, the boys sit hour after hour, picking out the pieces of slate and other refuse from the coal as it rushes past to the washers. From the cramped position they have to assume most of them become *more or less deformed and bent backed, like old men.*

When a boy has been working for some time and begins to get round shouldered, his fellows say that "he's got his boy to carry round wherever he goes." The coal is hard, and accidents to the hands, such as cut, broken, or crushed fingers, are common among the boys. Some times there is a worse accident. A terrified shriek is heard, and a boy is mangled and torn in the machinery, or disappears in the chute, to be picked out later smothered and dead.

He gives some examples of that.

Clouds of dust fill the breakers and are inhaled by the boys, laying the foundations for asthma and miners' consumption.

I once stood on a breaker for half an hour and tried to do the work a 12-year old boy was doing day after day, for ten hours at a stretch, for 60 cents a day.

The gloom of the breaker appalled me. Outside the sun shone brightly, the air was pelucid, and the birds sang in chorus with the trees and the rivers.

Within the breaker there was blackness, clouds of deadly dust enfolded everything, the harsh, grinding roar of the machinery and the ceaseless rushing of coal through the chutes filled the ears.

I tried to pick out the pieces of slate from the hurrying stream of coal, often missing them; my hands were bruised and cut in a few minutes. I was covered from head to foot with coal dust, and for many hours afterwards I was expectorating some of the small particles of anthracite I had swallowed. *I could not do that work and live; but there were boys of 10 and 12 years of age doing it for 50 and 60 cents a day.* Some of them had never been inside of a school; few of them could read a child's primer.

From the breakers the boys graduate to the mine depth, where they become door tenders, switch boys, or mule drivers. Here, far below the surface, the work is still more dangerous.

Mr. Spargo has made an affidavit to the truthfulness of these statements.

He proceeds to describe the work the boy is put to do in the mines. It is done many hundreds or thousands of feet, whatever the depth may be, *beneath the earth.*

Here is another example taken from another industry:

In New Jersey and Pennsylvania I have seen hundreds of children, boys and girls, between the ages of 10 and 12 years, at work in the factories belonging to the "cigar trust." Some of these factories are known as "kindergartens" on account of the large number of small children employed in them. It is by no means a rare occurrence for children in these factories to faint or to fall asleep over their work, and I have heard a foreman in one of them say that it was "enough for one man to do just to keep the kids awake."

In the domestic manufacture of cheap cigars many very young children are employed. Often the "factories" are poorly lighted, ill-ventilated tenements in which work, whether for children or adults, ought to be absolutely prohibited. Children work often as many as *fourteen or even sixteen hours* in these little "home factories," and in cities like Pittsburgh, Pa., it is not unusual for them, after attending school all day, to work from 4 p. m. to 12.30 a. m. making "tobles" or "stogies," for which they receive from 8 to 10 cents per hundred.

I shall show, when I come to the point at which I shall show that the State laws are not enforced—shamefully not enforced—that the same thing is done in York, and that children as young as 3 years of age are required to work nearly all day and at night until as late as 10 o'clock.

I now ask to have read the affidavit which I send to the Secretary's desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK, County of New York, ss:

Owen R. Lovejoy, assistant secretary of the National Child Labor Committee, of said city and county, being duly sworn, deposes and says that the instances, occurrences, and conversations given by him in his article in the Outlook August 26, 1905, entitled "Schoolhouse or breaker," and in the Woman's Home Companion September, 1906, entitled "In the shadow of the coal breaker," were witnessed or heard or examined by him in person, and that each one of the same is true.

OWEN R. LOVEJOY.

Sworn and subscribed to before me this 9th day of January, 1907.

[SEAL.]

E. H. OPITZ.

Notary Public for the City and County of New York.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. In addition to the fact that Mr. Lovejoy makes affidavit to this, I will state that this is published in the Outlook.

The Outlook is not one of "them there magazines," as a very prominent opponent of this bill describes these publications. The Outlook is probably as high class a publication as there is in this country or in the world; and I believe it to be true—at least I have understood—that nothing appears in this magazine which its great editor, Dr. Lyman Abbott, who is

beloved by the American people as much as he is trusted by them, does not feel willing to vouch for himself.

So that the testimony which I am going to give is of the highest possible character that could be adduced, unless you were to produce the witness on the floor of the Senate and cross-question him, and afterwards establish his reputation for "truth and veracity." Says Mr. Lovejoy, describing the breakers.

I will cut out everything except the definite facts speaking of the abuse and nonenforcement of the law—and *the State laws are utterly inadequate everywhere.*

The best inspection in this country by far is in the State of Illinois, as it is the second best law in the Nation and one of the best in the world. And yet I shall show by a great woman from your own town, Jane Addams, and the rest of the people who have investigated this will testify, that the law is not observed.

This is a description of the coal breakers of Pennsylvania and the nonenforcement of the law there. This is in August, 1905.

Says Mr. Lovejoy, under oath:

One group of little men, a picked squad from a company of twenty boys, only three of whom claimed to be old enough to meet the legal requirements of employment, were induced to tell the truth to one who was neither an "inspector" nor a "truant officer."

The reason the author says that is because boys will get from their parents certificates that they are 14 years of age, which is the required age (*although they are only 8 or 10*), or whatever is necessary. They have a common expression in the coal-mining regions of Pennsylvania concerning these certificates of age.

A boy will say: "I got it of the squire." He goes to the "squire," it seems, and pays 25 cents, or his father does, and he gets a "certificate," he, of course, "swearing" to it. But they are not held accountable, because they do not believe that their jobs are in danger. Oh, they are great things, those State laws!

Here are some more of Mr. Lovejoy's sworn statements:

And their answers were as follows:

"Nine; goin' on 10."

"Nine years old."

"Ten; goin' to be 11."

"Nine last June."

"Ten; goin' for 'leven."

An examination of the school records confirmed the statement of the boys. Relations of almost intimate friendship sprung out of a brief visit to this breaker, due, perhaps, partly to the courage the boys may have ascribed to a stranger who would venture into the place of their daily labor.

The coal at this breaker is cleaned "dry," and the dust arises in a cloud that hovers above the building sometimes for an hour after the day's work is done. The boys wear mine lamps in their caps—

That is in the daytime, you understand—

to enable them to see the coal at their feet.

An attempt to photograph the interior of the breaker in operation with time exposures varying from three to thirty seconds, made no impression on the film. At a neighboring breaker, better equipped with fans for drawing off the dust, a dim picture was secured.

Here twenty-two boys were interviewed at the noon interval, of whom all were under 14 years except one Scotch boy—14—whose age by the school record was found to be 10, and one Irish boy of 15, who has been out of school for over six years. Of the others, one was 9—8 by the school record—three were 10, two were 11, six were 12, and three were 13, although the school record showed one of the 13-year-old boys to be 11.

Now, Mr. President and Senators, mark the ages—8, 9, 10, 11, 12—although the law of that State requires that it shall be 14 at the minimum and 16 at the maximum for certain kinds of work in the mine.

Now, what kind of work is it that boys of that age are doing? Let us find out. Mr. Lovejoy tells us:

For nine hours a day these little fellows toil in the breaker—

Nine hours, mind you—

For nine hours a day these little fellows toil in the breaker, bending over the coal chute, with their feet in the coal, picking out the rock and slate. We are often asked whether this air is bad for the health! A five-minute visit to such a breaker will coat the lungs and throat with a black dust which twenty-four hours of pure air can not clear from the mucous linings.

Boys 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 years of age work nine hours a day under those circumstances!

This nine-hour day is broken by the dinner "hour," beginning in some breakers at 12.05 and ending at 12.25!

Are Senators willing to take such a hurried lunch as that? And would Senators permit their children to eat so hurriedly? Of course all of us are anxious to have our own children work like these boys work, for are we not all "self-made men?" But isn't the eating a little hard? Twenty minutes for lunch in a nine-hour day for boys of that age in a breaker! But let us follow Mr. Lovejoy. He says, and under oath:

allowing the boys twenty minutes to swallow the contents of their dinner pails, with unwashed hands and dust-filled throat and lungs—and this is the visitor's opportunity.

Mr. Lovejoy, from having experience in the mines, from

having gone into the breaker and trying to do a boy's work, describes just what that means. He says:

To sit bent over a stream of coal which pours out a cloud of dust so thick that the light can not penetrate; to be responsible for the exact separation from the coal of all slate and rock, depending often entirely upon the sense of touch; to endure the incessant rattle of deafening gigantic machinery; to suffer the stifling summer heat and the choice between the blasts that sweep these mountain tops and the cloud of smothering dust in the winter; to be conscious that the "boss" stands behind with a stick or small piece of coal to prompt to duty if the natural exuberance of childhood breaks out in playfulness or if backache induces a moment of forgetfulness; to have the hands cut and crippled and hardened by contact with the rough stones and bits of sharp-edged coal; to learn to control the nausea caused by swallowing quantities of coal dust, and by the feeling that one's throat and lungs are never clean—

That is the description of the work that these boys are called to do in the breakers.

Mr. President, I wonder if when people find what they call a "clinker" in their coal, they know just what that means? This is what it means: It means that one boy's eye has become dimmed after nine hours' work; that his fingers are bleeding, and he has neglected to get out the slate or the slag, which it is his business to pick from among the coal, and that, going into the coal and finally going into our furnaces, constitutes a "clinker."

So every time you find a "clinker" in your grate or stove you may know that it represents the utter exhaustion of a boy from 8 years old to, perhaps, 14 years old.

Then Mr. Lovejoy, who is a very conservative writer, as you may judge from what he says, continues:

If these were isolated instances of premature child labor, there would still remain cause for a protest against that which sacrifices life for gold, for the progress of the race waits breathless upon the unfolding of every human life.

But this appropriation of the days of childhood to the service of material gain is a settled policy of the coal region, against which the best public sentiment has hardly ventured to express disapproval.

Well, I think we, the representatives of the American people in Congress, had better stop that "settled policy of the coal regions." The State has not and can not.

Those who do not participate in the custom still condone it with the mature wisdom that "the children are better off than they would be running the streets."

But, Mr. President, I have actually heard that very same "argument" here in conversation on the floor of this Senate.

Then Mr. Lovejoy proceeds to describe the extent of this child labor in this particular instance and the extent to which the children are taken from school, or rather the extent to which the schools are emptied of children in this process of working in the breakers.

There are other forms of labor for boys, both in the breaker and in the mine. Boys are employed to "sprag" the cars as they come from the shaft to the top of the breaker building, to tend to chutes, to turn switches, and to drive the mules that haul the cars.

One bright little fellow, who was just 14 years old on June 6, has been working here, tending the chutes, for two years. He earns 6 cents an hour. Inside the mine the boys will tell you they are "tending gate," or "driving team," or "spraggin' cars and 'branchin' empties."

One of these little boys, 14 years old, who has been employed in the mine two and one-half years—

That is, that he began at 11½ years of age—

after having worked in the breaker a year and a half, seems to find the company of "Baldy," the mule, quite congenial, and is credited with a more unabridged command of sacred language than is possessed by any other man on the job. This work is better paid, but the dangers are greater and the number of boys employed is far less.

If the employment of little children in the breaker can be restricted, there will be slight difficulty in regulating the employment of children under proper age at other forms of mine labor.

On every hand are found bright boys, and even grown youth, who are entirely illiterate. This is not surprising of the newly arrived immigrant, but it is difficult to suppress a feeling of resentment against a custom which brings you face to face with English and Welsh young men, 18 or 20 years of age—not vagrants, but steady, industrious toilers—who can not read a word of our language.

The memory of one such stands out in striking relief. He is 18 years old, and when asked to read a simple sentence said pathetically, "I can't read; I've worked in the coal mines every day for the past nine years."

This, Mr. President, is Mr. Lovejoy's description of working in the breakers; and while I am on this point I might as well finish Mr. Spargo's testimony. This also, which I am going to read, is included in the affidavit which I have had the Secretary read from the desk.

This is a description giving the names, places, and ages of the boys in the breakers of the Pennsylvania mines. It may be a little monotonous; it may not be as interesting as some other large questions—some "constitutional questions"—but it is a matter of vital concern to the American people, and it is necessary to take the time to show just precisely, in detail, what this labor means.

Nor would I do it if it had not been written by the most careful of men. So far as these men are concerned, I personally know some of them. There are some others that I do not

know, who swear to the truth of their testimony. Quoting the boss of a breaker, Mr. Lovejoy says:

"The little devils like it," he continued, as some remark from his sentimental visitor expressed a protest against such work for little boys. They sat, about forty in number, bent over the troughs in which the coal came pouring down from the crushing machinery—

I suppose everybody here knows what a breaker is. A breaker is a gigantic building built very high at one end and lower at the other, to the high end of which the coal is lifted from the mine.

There are then chutes through which this coal passes by zig-zag paths until it enters into and runs across this chute, through which the coal passes in great streams.

There are crosspieces, and on those crosspieces these boys sit and bend over all day long—it used to be ten hours a day, it is now nine hours a day.

The boys stoop and catch the coal with their feet as it rushes past them and pick out the pieces of stone and slate.

That is what a breaker is, and that is the work of the breaker boys.

They sat, about forty in number, bent over the troughs in which the coal came pouring down from the crushing machinery, and with rough and hardened but deft little fingers picked out the slate and rock and "bony" from among the pieces of coal. Indeed, the jovial grins on the black faces of the boys as they watched the stranger feel his way through the dust and among the timbers of the breakers seemed to confirm the eulogy upon their occupation.

That is, the eulogy of the boss.

The dust which blinded the eyes and filled the nasal passages and choked and strangled one unaccustomed to such air had become their element, and one instinctively felt that were they brought into the sunlight they would blink and shrink from the glare of day.

The breaker makes no effort to brighten its darkness or hush the hideous roar. In fact, the very mystery and danger of it are elements of attractiveness to boy life. The boy sits bent over his task for eight or nine hours every day. His back aches with the stoop and monotonous swing as he throws the slate and rock aside, while the coal runs through between his little feet. During the first weeks of his labor his hands are cut and torn, his nails are broken off, and the pain of handling the sharp stones and slate is intense.

At the earliest possible age—in many parts of the region at 9 or 10 years, though the law forbids his employment under 14—he is off for the coal breaker, with or without a few months in school, and he is thenceforward a trifling factor in a gigantic industrial process.

Twelve thousand little boys, ranging in age from 9 to 14 years, are believed to be working in the coal breakers of the anthracite field. This estimate was made a year ago after an investigation by the National Child Labor Committee. Another investigation just completed, also covering an extensive area of the region, confirms the former estimate, although, unfortunately, no accurate figures, either official or unofficial, are available.

Mr. President, I next send to the Secretary's desk and ask to have read the affidavit of Kellogg Durland.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK, County of New York, ss:

Kellogg Durland, of said city and county, being duly sworn, deposes and says that the instances, occurrences, and conversations given by him in his article in the Outlook, May 9, 1903, entitled "Child Labor in Pennsylvania," were witnessed or heard or examined by him in person, and that each one of the same is true to the best of his knowledge or belief.

KELLOGG DURLAND.

Sworn and subscribed to before me this 22d day of January, 1907.
[SEAL.] C. F. RIGOULOT,

Notary Public No. 45, New York County.

(Commission expires March 30, 1908.)

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, the last affidavit which I sent to the desk was that of Kellogg Durland. The article of Mr. Durland, also is in the Outlook, the high quality of whose articles is very well known to the entire reading world. I am giving this somewhat at length, because I wish to leave no Senator on either side of the Chamber any excuse, even if any of them desire an excuse, which, of course, they do not, for not giving their whole attention to this mighty human evil, and also through the channels of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to put these facts before the country.

Therefore I am going into details and shall go into more details hereafter. This is also a description of the work of children in Pennsylvania.

ANOTHER KIND OF CHILD SLAVERY.

Helen Sissack, a wan mite of a girl, who spoke no English, told Judge Gray that she cleaned bobbins at 3 cents an hour. She went to work at half past 6 at night and worked till half past 6 in the morning.

I think it is a most appropriate time to consider some facts like those. We have just voted ourselves \$7,500 a year salary, and properly voted ourselves that salary. Even that does not pay for the work that a hard-working Senator does here, and every one of us knows it. Still this salary was a matter of mighty interest to us—it is *our* salary, you know. But here is a

girl not 9 years old, who for 3 cents an hour begins work at half past 6 at night and works until half past 6 in the morning.

I tell the Senate that if the Senate and the country do not give some serious attention to human facts like that, we need not wonder at the creation of a class in this country which when we contemplate its existence makes every one of us tremble. It is quite as important to stop the labor of these children in Pennsylvania and in North Carolina as it is even to vote ourselves \$7,500 a year salary, which we have just now so properly done.

Mr. Durland continues:

It took her nearly an hour to get from her home to the mill, and the road led across fields that were exposed to the storms that sweep down the valley.

Does the Senate find that amusing—a girl going a mile or more across a storm-swept valley to begin work at half past 6 at night and work until 6 in the morning for 3 cents an hour? If so, I shall present some examples from other States that perhaps will amuse the Senate still more.

Says Mr. Durland:

I have gone over that very road in a winter afternoon when the bleak winds and snow were blowing from the hills, and it was a journey I should not care to make often. It was when this child had finished her story that Judge Gray exclaimed, with much feeling: "Here we actually find the flesh and blood of little children coined into money;" and, shortly after, "This matter of night labor by young girls should be thoroughly investigated by those who will not shirk the work and the result made known in every part of Pennsylvania." This work has been done.

That is the work that Judge Gray suggested.

Yet the indifference of legislators or the lack of public pressure has resulted in a continuance of the system, with never a strong hand raised in protest.

That particular part of Mr. Durland's article I desire to lay aside until I take up the subject of the efforts of those who are interested in child labor to defeat child-labor legislation when it is presented in their respective States.

Then Mr. Durland takes up the work of the boys on the breakers and describes it.

Mr. President, it has been suggested to me that on account of the lateness of the hour and the importance, especially of the legal part, of this argument, which, I am told, Senators desire to hear most, I suspend to-day and go on to-morrow. I am willing to do that, but I see that the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] has given notice that he will occupy the attention of the Senate immediately after the routine morning business to-morrow. If I could find the Senator from Montana, and he would give way to me for the completion of my argument in the morning, I would be very glad to yield. On account of having gotten started so late, I see it is going to be impossible to reach what, I am told, will interest Senators most, which is the presentation of the legal portion of this case.

Mr. CARTER entered the Chamber.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. With the consent and by the very great courtesy of the Senator from Montana, who has given notice of his intention to address the Senate upon another subject to-morrow morning, I will suspend for the present and continue in the morning. I wish to say that I regret that the appropriation bill took so long, for if I had had any notion that it would take longer than half past 1 o'clock I would have asked the Senator in charge of the bill to let the appropriation bill follow my argument, because I want my argument to be complete and unbroken. But in view of the fact that that was not done—and of course it was quite proper for all Senators to express themselves upon that important measure, a thing to which I did not object at all—my argument has been postponed until a very late hour in the day, and it is absolutely impossible to conclude even the question of facts this afternoon. A part of the facts which I shall present I desire to submit when the entire Senate is present, and particularly Senators on the other side of the Chamber, because they affect conditions in many of their States, which I know are as reprehensible in their opinion as in the opinion of any other Senator on the floor. I am satisfied they will be glad to hear it. It is absolutely out of the question to begin the discussion of the legal phase of the bill this afternoon. I shall hope to be able to show that there is no doubt about the legality and constitutionality of this measure.

I want to say in advance that I am personally very much obliged to the Senator from Montana for his courtesy.

Mr. CARTER. I understand from the Senator from Indiana that he will probably get through his remarks by the hour of 2 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If I begin at half past 12, I should say so. I might run longer, I will say to the Senator, and if that is not convenient to the Senator from Montana and his remarks are not going to be extensive, I could come in after him.

Mr. CARTER. I desire to accommodate myself to the Sena-

tor's convenience, but at the same time I should like very much to dispose of the subject I have in hand to-morrow—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Oh, of course.

Mr. CARTER. Before or immediately after 2 o'clock. If it can be personally adjusted between the Senator and myself as to the order—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; so that we can both go on to-morrow. I suspect it will finally take this form: The Senator intimated to me that it will probably take an hour for his remarks. We will undoubtedly get through the morning business to-morrow by half past 12, and I think it might be better for the Senator to make his remarks first, as he would get through, according to his estimate, at half past 1, and then I could take the floor and have uninterrupted sway for the remainder of my argument.

Mr. HOPKINS. The Senator from Indiana would not be limited then.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No. That would mean that I could go on at half past 1 and not be limited, as the Senator from Illinois suggests.

Mr. CARTER. That will probably turn out to be the fact.

AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I call your attention to the great desirability of enacting legislation to help American shipping and American trade by encouraging the building and running of lines of large and swift steamers to South America and the Orient.

The urgent need of our country's making an effort to do something like its share of its own carrying trade on the ocean has been called to our attention in striking fashion by the experiences of Secretary Root on his recent South American tour. The result of these experiences he has set forth in his address before the Trans-Mississippi Commercial Congress, at Kansas City, Mo., on November 20 last, an address so important that it deserves the careful study of all public men.

The facts set forth by Mr. Root are striking, and they can not but arrest the attention of our people. The great continent to the south of us, which should be knit to us by the closest commercial ties, is hardly in direct commercial communication with us at all, its commercial relations being almost exclusively with Europe. Between all the principal South American ports and Europe lines of swift and commodious steamers, subsidized by their home governments, ply regularly. There is no such line of steamers between these ports and the United States. In consequence, our shipping in South American ports is almost a negligible quantity; for instance, in the year ending June 30, 1905, there entered the port of Rio de Janeiro over 3,000 steamers and sailing vessels from Europe, but from the United States no steamers and only seven sailing vessels, two of which were in distress. One prime reason for this state of things is the fact that those who now do business on the sea do business in a world not of natural competition but of subsidized competition. State aid to steamship lines is as much a part of the commercial system of to-day as State employment of consuls to promote business. Our commercial competitors in Europe pay in the aggregate some twenty-five millions a year to their steamship lines—Great Britain paying nearly seven millions. Japan pays between three and four millions. By the proposed legislation the United States will still pay relatively less than any one of our competitors pays. Three years ago the Trans-Mississippi Congress formally set forth as axiomatic the statement that every ship is a missionary of trade, that steamship lines work for their own countries just as railroad lines work for their terminal points, and that it is as absurd for the United States to depend upon foreign ships to distribute its products as it would be for a department store to depend upon wagons of a competing house to deliver its goods. This statement is the literal truth.

Moreover, it must be remembered that American ships do not have to contend merely against the subsidization of their foreign competitors. The higher wages and the greater cost of maintenance of American officers and crews make it almost impossible for our people who do business on the ocean to compete on equal terms with foreign ships unless they are protected somewhat as their fellow-countrymen who do business on land are protected. We can not as a country afford to have the wages and the manner of life of our seamen cut down; and the only alternative, if we are to have seamen at all, is to offset the expense by giving some advantage to the ship itself.

The proposed law which has been introduced in Congress is in no sense experimental. It is based on the best and most successful precedents, as, for instance, on the recent Cunard contract with the British Government. As far as South America is concerned, its aim is to provide from the Atlantic and Pacific coasts better American lines to the great ports of South America than the present European lines. The South American Republics now see only our warships. Under this bill our trade friendship will be made evident to them. The bill proposes to build large-sized steamers of 16-knot speed. There are nearly 200 such steamships already in the world's foreign trade, and over three-fourths of them now draw subsidies—postal or admiralty or both. The bill will encourage our shipyards, which are almost as necessary to the national defense as battle ships, and the efficiency of which depends in large measure upon their steady employment in large construction. The proposed bill is of importance to our Navy, because it gives a considerable fleet of auxiliary steamships, such as is now almost wholly lacking, and also provides for an effective naval reserve.

The bill provides for 14 steamships, subsidized to the extent of over a million and a half, from the Atlantic coast, all to run to South American ports. It provides on the Pacific coast for 22 steamers subsidized to the extent of two millions and a quarter, some of these to run to South America, most of them to Manila, Australia, and Asia.

Be it remembered that while the ships will be owned on the coasts, the cargoes will largely be supplied by the interior, and that the bill will benefit the Mississippi Valley as much as it benefits the seaboard.

I have laid stress upon the benefit to be expected from our trade with South America. The lines to the Orient are also of vital importance. The commercial possibilities of the Pacific are unlimited, and for national reasons it is imperative that we should have direct and adequate communication by American lines with Hawaii and the Philippines. The existence of our present steamship lines on the Pacific is seriously threatened by the foreign subsidized lines. Our communications with the markets of Asia and with our own possessions in the Philippines, no less than our communications with Australia, should depend not upon foreign, but upon our own steamships. The Southwest and the Northwest should alike be served by these lines, and if this is done they will also give to the Mississippi Valley throughout its entire length the advantage of all trans-continental railways running to the Pacific coast. To fail to establish adequate lines on the Pacific is equivalent to proclaiming to the world that we have neither the ability nor the disposition to contend for our rightful share of the commerce of the Orient; nor yet to protect our interests in the Philippines. It would surely be discreditable for us to surrender to our commercial rivals the great commerce of the Orient, the great commerce we should have with South America, and even our own communications with Hawaii and the Philippines.

I earnestly hope for the enactment of some law like the bill in question.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 23, 1907.

TELEPHONE FRANCHISES IN PORTO RICO.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, and ordered to be printed:

The Senate and House of Representatives:

Referring to section 32 of the act approved April 12, 1900, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith an ordinance enacted by the executive council of Porto Rico and approved by the President of the United States.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 23, 1907.

INTERNATIONAL MARITIME EXPOSITION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Industrial Expositions, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the consideration of the respective Houses of the Congress, a report of the Acting Secretary of State representing the appropriateness of early action in order that the Government of the United States may be enabled to be fittingly represented at the International Maritime Exposition to be held at Bordeaux from May 1 to October 31 of this year to celebrate the centenary of steam navigation inaugurated by the American inventor, Robert Fulton.

The recommendations of this report have my hearty approval, and I hope that the Congress will see fit to make timely provision to enable the Government to respond appropriately to the invitation of the Government of France.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 23, 1907.

LOUIS CASTINETTE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which, with the accompanying bill, was referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

In compliance with the resolution of the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein) of the 21st instant, I return herewith Senate bill No. 3671, entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to Louis Castinette."

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 23, 1907.

DANIEL G. SMITH.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which, with the accompanying bill, was referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

To the Senate:

In compliance with the resolution of the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein) of the 21st instant, I return herewith Senate bill No. 5073, entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel G. Smith."

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 23, 1907.

COLUMBIA RIVER (WASHINGTON) BRIDGES.

Mr. KEAN obtained the floor.

Mr. PILES. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. KEAN. I do.

Mr. PILES. There are two little bridge bills on the Calendar which I am extremely anxious to get through. They are local. I hope the Senator from New Jersey will yield to me that they may be disposed of.

Mr. KEAN. I yield.

Mr. PILES. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 23561) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River between Walla Walla and Benton counties, in the State of Washington, by the North Coast Railroad Company.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. PILES. I now ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 23560) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River between Benton and Franklin counties, in the State of Washington, by the North Coast Railroad Company.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KEAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 24, 1907, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 23, 1907.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Thomas B. Stapp, of Tennessee, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Chattanooga, in the State of Tennessee. (Reappointment.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Cavalry Arm.

Lieut. Col. Peter S. Bomus, Sixth Cavalry, to be colonel from January 19, 1907, vice Godfrey, Ninth Cavalry, appointed brigadier-general.

Maj. Matthias W. Day, Fifteenth Cavalry, to be lieutenant-colonel from January 19, 1907, vice Bomus, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

Capt. John B. McDonald, detailed quartermaster, to be major from January 19, 1907, vice Day, Fifteenth Cavalry, promoted.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Passed Asst. Paymaster John R. Hornberger, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 30th day of July, 1906.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 23, 1907.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Henry L. Hines, of Massachusetts, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Springfield, in the State of Massachusetts.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Daniel W. Patrick, of North Carolina, to be collector of customs for the district of Pamlico, in the State of North Carolina.

Daniel H. Moody, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of Wiscasset, in the State of Maine.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Jerome E. Morse, United States Navy, retired, to be a lieutenant-commander on the retired list of the Navy from the 29th day of June, 1906, in accordance with a provision contained in the naval appropriation act approved on that date.

Asst. Engineer Henry E. Rhoades, United States Navy, retired, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to be a passed assistant engineer on the retired list of the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 29th day of June, 1906, in accordance with a provision contained in the naval appropriation act approved on that date.

Chaplain George A. Crawford, United States Navy, retired, with the rank of commander, to be a chaplain on the retired list of the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 29th day of June, 1906.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

Sheridan G. Berger to be postmaster at Ontario, in the county of San Bernardino and State of California.

Nora Buchanan to be postmaster at Black Diamond, in the county of Contra Costa and State of California.

Pierce J. Elliot to be postmaster at Sausalito, in the county of Marin and State of California.

Crispin C. Ortega to be postmaster at Sonora, in the county of Tuolumne and State of California.

CONNECTICUT.

Thomas F. Higgins to be postmaster at Terryville, in the county of Litchfield and State of Connecticut.

DELAWARE.

Douglass C. Allee to be postmaster at Dover, in the county of Kent and State of Delaware.

ILLINOIS.

Robert C. Boehm to be postmaster at White Hall, in the county of Greene and State of Illinois.

Harry M. Martin to be postmaster at Shelbyville, in the county of Shelby and State of Illinois.

INDIANA.

Walter Bradfute to be postmaster at Bloomington, in the county of Monroe and State of Indiana.

John S. Glenn to be postmaster at Huntington, in the county of Huntington and State of Indiana.

Seward S. Watson to be postmaster at Winchester, in the county of Randolph and State of Indiana.

LOUISIANA.

Benjamin Deblieux to be postmaster at Plaquemine, in the parish of Iberville and State of Louisiana.

MICHIGAN.

John Amessee to be postmaster at Lake Linden, in the county of Houghton and State of Michigan.

Joshua Braun to be postmaster at Sebewaing, in the county of Huron and State of Michigan.

Charles M. Falls to be postmaster at Wolverine, in the county of Cheboygan and State of Michigan.

MINNESOTA.

Charles E. Fuller to be postmaster at St. James, in the county of Watonwan and State of Minnesota.

John L. Grady to be postmaster at Cass Lake, in the county of Cass and State of Minnesota.

Edward F. Gummer to be postmaster at Frazee, in the county of Becker and State of Minnesota.

NEW YORK.

Clarence M. Bates to be postmaster at Cherry Valley, in the county of Otsego and State of New York.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Willis G. Briggs to be postmaster at Raleigh, in the county of Wake and State of North Carolina.

William J. Flowers to be postmaster at Mount Olive, in the county of Wayne and State of North Carolina.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Benjamin F. Hevener to be postmaster at Ardmore, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania.

RHODE ISLAND.

Charles S. Robinson to be postmaster at Lonsdale, in the county of Providence and State of Rhode Island.

VERMONT.

John S. Sweeney to be postmaster at Island Pond, in the county of Essex and State of Vermont.

Frank T. Taylor to be postmaster at Hardwick, in the county of Caledonia and State of Vermont.

James H. Viele to be postmaster at Essex Junction, in the county of Chittenden and State of Vermont.

WISCONSIN.

Edward M. Crane to be postmaster at Oshkosh, in the county of Winnebago and State of Wisconsin.

Francis R. Dittmer to be postmaster at Seymour, in the county of Outagamie and State of Wisconsin.

Charles Kinnach to be postmaster at Cudahy, in the county of Milwaukee and State of Wisconsin.

William H. Landolt to be postmaster at Wauwatosa, in the county of Milwaukee and State of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 23, 1907.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Agriculture, by the direction of that committee, reported the bill (H. R. 24815) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to give notice that I will ask for the consideration of the bill to-morrow immediately after the reading of the Journal.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 24640) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes. And pending that I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be divided equally between the two sides, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN] and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the pension bill, and pending that asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate be equally divided, one half to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan how long general debate is likely to run.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. It is quite impossible to say now, but three hours have been asked for on this side of the House.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN] is not now in the House, but I will agree to the request made by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN], as I understand, has agreed to this.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. It is so understood. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is the other member of the minority of the subcommittee.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I will agree to it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the pension bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. TOWNSEND in the chair.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the bill as reported from the Committee on Appropriations carries \$137,000,000 for the payment of pensions for the year ending June 30, 1908, as against \$139,000,000 for the current year.

The total number of pensioners on the roll June 30, 1906, was 985,971, as against 998,441 at the same date in the preceding year.

The loss in civil-war pensioners during the year was 20,543, in pensioners in all wars previous to the civil war was 1,028, making the total loss 21,571. The gain in pensioners during the year from the civil war was 6,212, from the war with Spain 2,130, and from the regular establishment 759, making a total gain of 9,102.

The net loss to the pension roll during the current year was 12,470, or 1.26 per cent.

There are now 666,453 civil-war pensioners on the rolls. Of

these, 302,605 draw \$10 or less per month, 557,905 \$12 or less, and but 128,543 who draw over \$12 per month.

The number of applications filed in 1906 was less than in any year since 1884. This would indicate that there are but comparatively few remaining in the "unknown army" of nonpension-drawing soldiers who intend to apply.

It is interesting to note that in eight years after the close of war with Spain the Government had paid in pensions on account of that war a sum equal to 22 per cent of the total paid to the pensioners charged to the Revolution, 34 per cent of the sum paid because of the war with Mexico, and 40 per cent of the sum total paid on account of the war of 1812-14.

Mr. DRISCOLL. The gentleman from Michigan means new applications?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. New applications, showing that what is known as the "army of nonpensioners" has nearly vanished, that there will be comparatively few additional new applications for pensions.

Another lesson may be learned from this, that down to 1870 the Navy pensioners were paid out of the Navy fund.

This year the Navy fund pays less than 9 per cent of the amount required for the men upon this line.

Mr. GOULDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman, for my own information, how that Navy fund was created? I notice it amounts to something over \$14,000,000.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Generally speaking, from the sale of prizes, but, for the gentleman's information and for the information of the House, I will embody in my answer a quotation from the statutes on this subject:

SEC. 4751. All penalties and forfeitures incurred under the provisions of sections 2461, 2462, and 2463, title, "The public lands," shall be sued for, recovered, distributed, and accounted for under the directions of the Secretary of the Navy, and shall be paid over, one half to the informers, if any, or captors, where seized, and the other half to the Secretary of the Navy for the use of the Navy pension fund; and the Secretary is authorized to mitigate, in whole or in part, on such terms and conditions as he deems proper, by an order in writing, any fine, penalty, or forfeiture so incurred.

SEC. 4752. All money accruing or which has already accrued to the United States from sale of prizes shall be and remain forever a fund for the payment of pensions to officers, seamen, and marines who may be entitled to receive the same; and if such fund be insufficient for the purpose, the public faith is pledged to make up the deficiency; but if it should be more than sufficient, the surplus shall be applied to the making of further provision for the comfort of the disabled officers, seamen, and marines.

Mr. GOULDEN. I did not know. It was a stumbling block in my way when I struck it in the committee's report.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I think that is it. Here is another thought. It is to be expected that for some years there will be a steady increase of the widows added to the pension rolls from the veterans of the civil war.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Will there not be a steady increase of the Spanish-American soldiers and soldiers of the Philippine war?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I was just coming to that now. It is expected also, as the gentleman from New York suggests, that there will be for years to come a steady increase of pensioners from the soldiers engaged in the war with Spain. More than that, there has been and there will continue to be a steady increase from the regular establishment. From these three sources we derive an offset in part from the reductions that come because of the deaths of the civil-war soldiers. So that there will not be that marked decline in the number of pensioners upon the rolls that has been generally expected.

The only item in the bill that is likely to provoke any considerable controversy is the recommendation of the committee to appropriate for the maintenance of nine pension agencies. There are now eighteen of these. The committee do this in the belief that it will add to the economy and the efficiency of the service.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman again? Will he kindly tell the committee how he arrives at the conclusion recommending certain cities and omitting others which are now regular pension agencies?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that the whole matter was gone into somewhat thoroughly by the subcommittee, and after getting the information furnished by the Commissioner of Pensions we asked from him a statement as to a proposed scheme of consolidation. He presented what may be termed a "tentative arrangement"—nothing definite in the scheme offered by him or suggested by him as appears in the hearings; and yet I want to be entirely frank with the committee and say that if the consolidation takes place it will probably be along the line suggested by the Pension Commissioner in the scheme proposed. Now, why were certain cities omitted and others included? Take the city from which the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN] comes. It so happens that there are two pension agencies in the State of New York,

one in the city of New York and the other in the city of Buffalo. New York City is the only pension agency of the entire eighteen that now pays a rent. It costs the Government \$4,500 a year for quarters in which to house the agency in New York City. In Buffalo there is no rent. Hence I assume that the Commissioner reasoned that we had better take the entire agency to Buffalo rather than to New York, because in the former city we have free quarters in a Government building.

Mr. DALZELL. May I interrupt the gentleman a moment? Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. DALZELL. If I read the report aright, the city in which I live, Pittsburg, is omitted as one of the agencies to be abolished. The pension agency in that city is in the Federal building, and the Government is not called upon to pay any rent.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield for a suggestion?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. BENNET of New York. We are just completing in New York City a Federal building, in which unquestionably the pension agency would be housed without paying rent, so that there is no ground for that excuse.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] I would say this, that New York, as has been stated, was eliminated in the proposed scheme because they had rent to pay. It is the only agency housed in other than a Government building, hence if any consolidations are to be made the remaining agencies must be taken from Government buildings and put with those now in Government buildings. Pennsylvania has two agencies. Pittsburg pays in round numbers \$6,000,000 a year and Philadelphia \$7,000,000 a year. It has been shown that the larger agencies can be conducted with much greater economy than the small agencies are. For example, Topeka, the largest agency of the whole lot, pays 113,500 soldiers, at an average cost of 40 cents per pensioner. Augusta, one of the smallest of the agencies, pays about \$3,000,000, and the exact number of pensioners there is only 17,700. It costs 73 cents a man to pay the pensioners in that agency. The average cost is 53 cents—costing 21 cents more per pensioner in the smaller agencies than in the average and 31 cents more than at the Topeka agency.

Mr. DALZELL. Why is there to be a consolidation at Philadelphia?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Now, you ask why the consolidation in Philadelphia.

Mr. DALZELL. On the score of economy, how much would it save per man to transfer the office from Pittsburg to Philadelphia?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. In that specific instance it is very difficult to estimate, but we do know this, that between the maximum of the Augusta agency at 73 cents per pensioner and the Topeka agency at 40 cents per pensioner, these representing the two extremes, the saving is the difference between those two of nearly 50 per cent, and I may say further—and I would like to have all gentlemen note this—that there is no more complaint on the part of the soldiers who are paid from the Topeka agency than those who are paid from the Augusta or Concord agency.

Mr. SULLOWAY and several gentlemen rose.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I heard the gentleman from New Hampshire first, I think.

Mr. SULLOWAY. I would like to ask the gentleman what the saving would be to the Government by abolishing the agency at Concord, which pays New Hampshire and Vermont soldiers? That agency is established in a Government building, and there is no rental whatever. Is it his position here that because you save 20 or 22 cents to a man that they shall wait five or six weeks to get their pensions?

Mr. DALZELL. I do not understand the gentleman from Michigan has stated in the particular instance to which I have referred that there would be any saving per man in transferring the office from Pittsburg to Philadelphia.

Mr. SULLOWAY. I beg pardon, if I interrupted the gentleman.

Mr. DALZELL. You did not interrupt me, but on the score of economy I have not heard from the gentleman yet any reason why that particular transfer should be made.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Neither have I in the case I cited.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I think perhaps it may be made a little clearer to the gentleman if he will note, for instance, in Philadelphia there are twenty-seven clerks—

Mr. DALZELL. Philadelphia pays out \$7,000,000 and Pittsburg pays out \$6,000,000.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. In Pittsburg there are twenty-four clerks, making fifty-one clerks in those two agencies, paying about \$13,000,000. There are thirty-nine clerks in Topeka, paying \$16,000,000. Now, you can figure out, gentlemen, on the basis of the average, not the specific instance from Philadelphia, Pittsburg, or Concord, but the general average to-day is 53 cents.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Does it amount to anything practical in the soldier getting his pension sooner?

Mr. DALZELL. I want to call the gentleman's attention to this: I do not care anything about Topeka or a comparison between Topeka and Augusta. What I want to know is what saving will there be by transferring the Pittsburg agency to Philadelphia? That is the only thing I am particularly interested in at this time.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. You mean in that particular case?

Mr. DALZELL. In that particular case what will be the saving to the United States Government?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Now, the gentleman can readily see, if he has at all given consideration to the subject, that we can not figure out specifically what will be saved in that particular combination. We do know what can be saved all along the line.

Mr. DALZELL. That is exactly what I want to show, that you can not pick out any particular nine agencies of these eighteen agencies that with justice should be abolished.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Yes; we will come to that later. I want to ask the gentleman from New Hampshire. He asked what is the benefit of this if it delays the soldier four or five days in getting his pension.

Mr. SULLOWAY. I said weeks; I intended to.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Is it possible? Weeks! Now, gentlemen, the Commissioner of Pensions shows that any place east of the Mississippi River can be reached by mail in twenty-four hours from Washington.

Mr. OTJEN. Why not pay them all from Washington?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. We will get to that shortly.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Is it not his purpose to consolidate the whole shooting match at Washington and—

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman that we had the "shooting match" more than forty years ago. Now, if this combination takes place the consolidation for the payment of all the New England soldiers will be made in a general office. I do not speak authoritatively, but probably in the city of Boston.

Why, you can walk anywhere over in New England from Boston and get back again in less than five weeks.

Mr. SULLOWAY. I would suggest to the gentleman to come up sometime and take the exercise. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. The gentleman certainly does not wish to stand on the proposition that the proposed consolidation will delay the New England soldiers four or five weeks or four or five days. It will not delay them twenty-four hours if every pensioner is paid from the city of Boston rather than from Concord, Boston, and Augusta.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Surely.

Mr. SULLOWAY. How many in New England would be paid from the city of Boston?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. In round numbers, 100,000.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Are there not more than that?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Well, more or less. It may be more rather than less.

Mr. GOULDEN. If the gentleman will pardon me, the number is 94,229. This is from the figures given by the Commissioner of Pensions.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Will it lessen the clerical force one single individual in preparing these vouchers and sending out the envelopes with checks in them?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. That is the belief and is in the statement made by the Commissioner. Now, this is the situation: We have in each one of the eighteen agencies a force of clerks that are rushed, say, for ten days or two weeks, and then they have comparatively nothing to do for the balance of the quarter. Now, the scheme is to give these clerks something to do for more than the comparatively short time required to pay the pensioners under the present arrangement.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question right there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. SULLOWAY. If that is a fact, why do you not lessen

the number of clerks? Surely a lot of fellows with nothing on hand—

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I did not quite get that.

Mr. SULLOWAY. If it is a fact that you have a lot of clerks, or a number of clerks, speaking more politely, in these agencies who have nothing to do except for a few days, why do you not lessen the clerical force?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. For the very reason that the gentleman has already intimated as his objection to changing the Concord agency to Boston, that to have a smaller force of clerks would prolong the period necessary in which to give prompt deliverance of the quarterly checks to the pensioners.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Are not all the checks written out in advance and signed in advance, and ready to put in the envelopes when the vouchers arrive in proper form?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. But there is a certain set of machinery—

Mr. SULLOWAY. What set of machinery is required in order to draw the checks, address the envelopes, except to put the checks in them?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman suggested that. Already they are employing in the larger of these agencies addressing machines and folding machines to save help. In other words, they are doing precisely what one of you business men would do if you were conducting your own private business—using the modern labor-saving appliances—and that is what will be done.

Mr. SULLOWAY. That means a lessening of the clerks, does it not?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. LITTAUER. Less expense as well, does it not?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Certainly; the expense reduced in proportion to the number of clerks cut out and agencies reduced.

Mr. SULLOWAY. What is the objection to lessening the clerical force now? That is what I want to know. If it is a fact that you have a surplus of clerks on hand.

Mr. LITTAUER. When they are subdivided they can not be reduced.

Mr. SULLOWAY. What is the reason?

Mr. LITTAUER. A force gathered together and working altogether can do the same amount of work with a less number of individuals employed than if they be scattered round about.

Mr. SULLOWAY. There is nothing in that whatever. If you have got to let them have less clerical force at the agency at Concord, it is well enough to do it, and why not discharge them instead of discontinuing the agency? The same clerical force will be needed that you now have. There is no question about that. This is simply a question of consolidating these offices, bunching them, to the inconvenience of the soldiers of this country.

Mr. LITTAUER. I can not understand in what way the gentleman means they will be inconvenienced.

Mr. SULLOWAY. In delay.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York to proceed with his question.

Mr. LITTAUER. I can not appreciate this matter of delay at all. I am advised here that soldiers continue to receive their checks from Washington in some localities in Ohio and other States within thirty hours of the day in which they are due.

Mr. SULLOWAY. It may be so in certain instances.

Mr. LITTAUER. This whole proposition is a matter looking toward economy, paying less for clerk hire, by making a consolidation of the work rather than having it spread all over.

Mr. SULLOWAY. I fail to understand the economy of rent, when the agency is in a public building that pays no rent whatever.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that in a letter of Commissioner Warner, which treats of the question of economy raised by the gentleman from New Hampshire, there is rent of \$4,500; salaries for nine pension agencies, \$36,000; clerk hire, stationery, printing, and other items for clerks, \$64,000, making a total saving of \$104,500, as given by the Commissioner of Pensions.

Mr. SULLOWAY. There is no rent for the agency at Concord, N. H.

Mr. GOULDEN. No; but the rental is at New York, which will not continue beyond a year or two, when the new custom-house will be completed.

Mr. SULLOWAY. I am not talking about New York City.

Mr. GOULDEN. Yes; but there is the saving of the salaries of the pension agents at points where the agency is abolished.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Oh, yes; there is no question about that.

Mr. GOULDEN. And I want to ask the gentleman from Michigan while I am on the floor if there was no rent to be paid in New York City, would you recommend the discontinuance of that agency, when there are 10,000 more pensioners paid in New York than in the city of Buffalo?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. In reply to the gentleman from New York, I will repeat my statement earlier in the discussion that this is a scheme presented, not by the committee, as you will find, but by the Commissioner of Pensions. It is simply a tentative arrangement; but I have no doubt in my mind that if New York had free quarters, as Buffalo has, the proposed agency would have been retained in New York rather than Buffalo.

Mr. GOULDEN. Ten thousand more pensioners are paid in New York than in Buffalo, and if we have no rent to pay, as suggested by my colleague from New York [Mr. BENNET], I do not see any reason why New York should have been left out of this game, as it appears to me.

Mr. LITTAUER. What game?

Mr. GOULDEN. That's the way it looks to the average Member, to favor certain places at the expense of others.

Mr. WEEKS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan what the effect would be of dispensing with all pension agencies—whether the pensioner would be delayed in getting his pension, and what the saving would be in expense, if any.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I will say, Mr. Chairman, that that is the ideal scheme, and one that will ultimately be come to. Every pensioner can be paid from the city of Washington, and after the receipt of his first quarterly stipend he will notice no difference from now, though he might have a pension agency within five doors of his residence.

Mr. SULLOWAY. May I ask the gentleman why?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Just a moment. The interval between the receipt of his payment would be the same. Why, we have a large number of pensioners who are paid in Canada, Ireland, and Germany. They make their vouchers and send them here to Washington, and the pensions are sent to people living in these far-away countries, who receive their pensions three months from the date of the preceding one from year to year, if they are permanent residents abroad. Now, the saving will be very great if that can be done. That matter was canvassed in the committee, and it was ascertained that there are no quarters obtainable in this city now that would house the necessary pension force without renting; but the Commissioner of Pensions says that in the course of a few years there will be plenty of room in the present Pension building, where, with the clerical force and the machinery necessary, the payment of pensions in every quarter of the world could conveniently be made. This is a step in that direction, and the committee feel it is better to do this now than to delay until that time comes.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. Did the committee inquire into the question whether it would be possible to have a pension agency in every Congressional district in the United States and whether that would not be more convenient to the pensioners than to have the eighteen that we now have?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I presume that men could be gotten to take pension agencies, if there was one in every Congressional district. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. Does not the gentleman think that an amendment of that kind would be vastly more popular than one seeking to cut off a few officials here and there?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. From the questions, I think such an amendment as that would carry here this morning. [Laughter.]

Mr. DALZELL. There is no pension agency in the Congressional district of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. NORRIS. I wanted to ask the same question that was asked by the gentleman from Massachusetts, when I interrupted the gentleman before; but I believe the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GARDNER] has not fully answered the question of the gentleman from Massachusetts. The question is, How much money would be saved if we could do away with all these pension agencies and let the payments all be made from the city of Washington?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Fully 50 per cent of the present cost, which is over half a million dollars.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, I should like to ask the gentleman what objection could there possibly be, outside of the one that he

has given, to such an arrangement, by which they should all be abolished and the pensioners all paid directly from the city of Washington?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. From a business point of view there would be no objection and everything would be in its favor, but politically there would be eighteen objections. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORRIS. If there are only eighteen objections, we ought to be able to pass such an amendment. It looks to me as though there were more than eighteen objections.

Mr. GRAHAM. I desire to call the attention of the chairman of this committee and also the attention of the House to the fact that under the statement made by the Commissioner of Pensions he shows but one rental of a pension agency to-day, that in New York. All the other pension agents are officially housed in United States Government buildings, so that there is only one place where they rent an office. By this proposition that one rental of \$4,500 will be saved. Then if they abolish these pension agencies they save the salaries of nine pension agents, at \$4,000 a year, or \$36,000, making a total of \$40,500 saved to the Government. Now, the estimate as to clerk hire is simply an estimate, that they may, under this consolidation, save a little clerk hire; but all the facts that they can produce show a saving of about \$40,000, and great inconvenience and delay to tens of thousands of old soldiers, simply to save \$40,000. I think the saving from reduction of clerical services can all be effected by the Department without consolidation if they desire it.

Mr. BRICK. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman if it is not a fact, admitted by the people who understand most about the pension business, that they expect no delay whatever by the reduction of the number of agencies.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. In the scheme proposed by the Pension Commissioner, if it should be finally settled upon between himself and the President, there will be no appreciable delay to any soldier in the country because of it.

Mr. BRICK. Now, if as proposed we reduce the number to nine and eventually reduce the whole business into one central agency for the whole United States, could not the employees be so marshaled and kept at work that there would not only be no delay to the soldiers, but that they might be paid once a month instead of once in three months?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana has mentioned a very important feature of the consolidation, particularly when it comes to the consolidation of all the agencies. The clerical force here can pay once each month throughout the entire year with great economy and without any appreciable effect upon the efficiency of the service and the promptness with which the soldier receives his pension.

Mr. BRICK. And if that takes place, there will probably be a reduction of 50 per cent in the expense.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. More than that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan what prevents under the present organization of the eighteen agencies the carrying out of the recommendation of Mr. Warner of having the work distributed by the month rather than by quarters; that instead of having vouchers issued only on one certain day in each quarter for certain States and certain Territories to have them issued once a month for portions of said sections, so as to keep the clerical force employed?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Well, take the Concord agency; of course—

Mr. STAFFORD. I would prefer to have the gentleman take the average agency. The Concord agency, the Louisville agency, the Augusta, Me., agency are the three that have less than 20,000 pensioners. Take the average agency that has above 40,000.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Suppose you adopt the scheme suggested by the gentleman from Wisconsin. Why insist on having eighteen agencies to do that work, when there is not a man on the floor who will not state if he investigates this subject that nine agencies can do the work just as well?

Mr. STAFFORD. If you are after consolidation, we might concede that one agent could do it just as well; but it would result in quicker consolidation into one agency if all the eighteen agencies should remain as they are at present, and when the pension roll becomes so depleted that the offices are all on a par with the Concord and the Augusta, Me., offices, then there would be no need of supervising agents at the large offices as at present maintained. At the large offices, like Milwaukee and Pittsburg, that have more than 40,000 pensioners, the argument of the Pension Commissioner, so far as changing the work by months rather than by quarters, can be put into force to-day. For instance, the Milwaukee agency, which has Wisconsin, Minnesota, and the Dakotas as its territory, the clerical force

can be applied one month to Wisconsin and the next to Minnesota, and the other month to the Dakotas, and the same saving in clerical force could be made as has been suggested by the Pension Commissioner. Now, I ask the gentleman why that argument does not apply to these agencies to-day and why the Pension Commissioner can not adopt the same system in the respective agencies and still retain the present agencies?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. The gentleman's position is faulty in this, that he would have the same force take care of 5,000 or 6,000 pensioners in Dakota, for example, and 20,000 in Wisconsin. You have got the same force to take care of them.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is not necessary to have territorial boundaries. They can be distributed according to location of pensioners, so as to apportion their number equally.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. May I ask why the gentleman abandons his position so soon as its faultiness is pointed out to him? That is good generalship. [Laughter.]

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not abandoning my position. If too many clerks are employed in the respective agencies they can be reduced so as to have them only adequate to do the work required of them. They can divide the work into sections, rather than to have them work for one entire section at one time during the quarter. I should like to ask the gentleman from Michigan another question.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. If it is intended to reduce these agencies to nine, I suppose it is contemplated to merge the Milwaukee agency with the Chicago agency. Is that the understanding of the gentleman?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I think that is in the proposed scheme by the Commissioner. But I have explained that that is not a fast and loose arrangement; it may be adjusted as later considerations and conditions shall determine. On the other hand, I think it is only fair to say that something of that kind will take place.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman considered the inadequacy of quarters in the Chicago Federal building to provide for this additional work that will be placed on the Chicago office?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman asks me individually whether I have considered that, I say "no." That is a matter of administration that comes to the Pension Commissioner and not to the Committee on Appropriations or to this House.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is a fact, if the gentleman will permit me, that the Chicago Federal building to-day is overcrowded for room and could not spare any room for additional quarters, and if the Pension Bureau wanted additional quarters they would have to go outside and rent them.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from Michigan a question.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LACEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not true, take the Des Moines agency as contrasted with the agency at Philadelphia or Washington, that the clerks there work for one-third less than they do at Chicago or Washington, because of the cheaper living there, and that when you consolidate this work in the great cities where it is more expensive to live, you must increase the compensation and thus do away with practically all the saving that you would make by consolidation?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would say in reply to that that these clerks are all under civil service, and that they are paid substantially alike throughout the country, as I understand it.

Mr. LACEY. I understand the contrary. They are all under the civil service, but their salaries are based somewhat to meet the expense of living in the localities where they are at work.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I think the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] is mistaken, but we can get the information as to that. I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BENNET of New York. I would like to ask the gentleman if the committee took into consideration, so far as New York is concerned, the fact that every pensioner in New York County—in fact, in the greater city—if this agency in New York is abolished, will have to pay exchange on his checks if the checks are sent out from Buffalo. That is the fact under the clearing house rules of New York City.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, I would ask the gentleman if it is not possible for the Buffalo agency to make a check upon the subtreasury in New York for every pension, so that it would be payable in New York funds?

Mr. BENNET of New York. I am not advised as to that at all.

Mr. PAYNE. But I am asking the gentleman from Michigan. Anybody ought to be able to answer that in the affirmative.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Why, certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. Anyone could answer that in the affirmative, as I say. And I know that my colleague [Mr. BENNET] could. Mr. BENNET of New York. The gentleman from Michigan got very sudden light.

Mr. PAYNE. And I want to suggest further to the gentleman from Michigan that he might ask some of these gentlemen whether there is not enough patriotism among them to try and save half a million dollars for the Treasury, even though they do have to give up the little patronage there is by maintaining these eighteen agencies? That is the burning question. It is a good deal like the question before the House some time ago when we talked of getting rid of one or two ports of entry in the United States where there were no collections.

Mr. BENNET of New York. I would like to ask my colleague if he would join with the rest of the patriots in the House in abolishing the Buffalo office?

Mr. PAYNE. I most certainly would.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Or the one at Auburn?

Mr. PAYNE. I most certainly would join in abolishing them all, and I would have them all paid from the city of Washington, and I would vote for it every day in the week if I had an opportunity.

Mr. GOULDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan what effort was made to ascertain the cost of the rental for the necessary building in the city of Washington so as to consolidate all the agencies in the one city? I ask that for information. The gentleman has told me that there would be 50 per cent saved in clerical and other expenses, and I would like to have the other question answered.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I would say that within the last year the Washington agency, with which it is proposed to consolidate the Knoxville and Louisville agencies, has been housed in the Pension building. They wanted better quarters—and they were in very poor quarters—that would cost, say, \$4,500. The Commissioner of Pensions said to the pension agent that he could make room for them in the general Pension building, and there they are to-day, without cost and conveniently located.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, in answer to my question about what the saving would be in case all of the pension agencies were abolished I understood the gentleman from Michigan to say about \$270,000.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. About half of the present appropriation, which is \$550,000.

Mr. WEEKS. I want to ask the gentleman from Michigan, that being the case, why he does not move to abolish all pension agencies, hire a whole building in the city of Washington, if it is necessary, for, say, \$20,000, and make a net saving of \$250,000?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, that is a business man talking, and he talks just like a business man would talk at home in conducting his private affairs, and I am sorry that we do not all take the same view of it here. As I said, that is the ideal thing to do, and we hope to reach it some day. The objection is now, as urged by the Pension Commissioner, that he has not the room to do it, but would have it probably in two or three years.

Mr. OLMSTED. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. OLMSTED. We have now in Pennsylvania two pension agencies, one at Pittsburg, on the extreme west, and the other at Philadelphia, on the extreme east. I live at Harrisburg, which is in the center of the State. We have been playing both ends against the middle, so to speak. I want to ask the gentleman, now that he is going to abolish one or concentrate them, whether it would not be perhaps a good thing—and I submit this particularly to my colleagues from Pittsburg and Philadelphia—to concentrate and have the consolidated office at Harrisburg, in the middle of the State? It is a most desirable place in which to live. We have a beautiful new capitol building there, and I think the pensioners would be willing to come and get their checks personally, just to see the beautiful city and the beautiful capitol that we have there. You know Harrisburg once came very near being the national capital.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I would respectfully refer the Pennsylvania delegation to the Commissioner of Pensions and the President to answer that. They will adjust the matter ultimately if the consolidation is approved by the Congress.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we ought to proceed with the regular discussion pertaining to this bill, and I therefore suggest that until the bill is taken up under the five-minute rule we forego occupying further time in this desultory way.

Mr. Chairman, there are several gentlemen who have asked for time. I do not see the gentleman from Ohio here [Mr. GROSVENOR].

Mr. SULLIVAN. I would like to speak for five or ten minutes myself now.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, Mr. SULLIVAN, who controls the time for the minority, desires to occupy a few minutes at this time.

Mr. PRINCE. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts permit me to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question before he begins?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois for a question.

Mr. PRINCE. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, who has this matter in charge, a question, and the gentleman from Massachusetts has yielded to me to do so. The question is this: You stated that in one, two, three, or four years' time there will be room in the Pension Office for the housing of the clerks who are necessary to transact the business of paying soldiers their vouchers from the city of Washington.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. That is anticipated.

Mr. PRINCE. Will you be kind enough to tell how the room is to be obtained?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I stated that up to comparatively recently the whole space in the Pension building has been occupied by the force that had to do with the issuing of pensions. A year ago the pension agent in this city made application to remove the quarters in which the business was carried on to more commodious and pleasanter quarters, and with good reason I may say. The Pension Commissioner ascertained that this project was on foot. He sent for the pension agent in this city and said to him: "I believe we can make room for you now, for we have a less number of clerks right here in this building." It was because of the reduction of clerical force in the Pension building that the pension agency in this city was transferred to that building, and is there now. That reduction, of course, is going on continually, and within a comparatively short time there will be an abundance of room for a force sufficiently large to pay all the pensions in the present Pension building.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 7270. An act to establish a fish-hatchling and fish-culture station at Dell Rapids, S. Dak.;

S. 7147. An act to amend section 2536 of the Revised Statutes, relative to assistant appraisers at the port of New York, and further defining their powers, duties, and compensation; and

S. 7793. An act to fix the time of holding the circuit and district courts of the United States in and for the northern district of Iowa.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to return to the House of Representatives, in compliance with its request, the bill (H. R. 1050) for the relief of Edwin S. Hall.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bills and joint resolution of the following titles:

S. 4423. An act providing for the donation of obsolete cannon, with their carriages and equipments, to the University of Idaho;

S. 4563. An act to prohibit corporations from making money contributions in connection with political elections; and

S. R. 86. Joint resolution granting an extension of time to certain homestead entrymen.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 24048. An act authorizing and empowering the Secretary of War to locate a right of way for and granting the same and a right to operate and maintain a line of railroad through the Fort Wright Military Reservation, in the State of Washington, to the Spokane and Inland Empire Railroad Company, its successors and assigns.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, this proposition to consolidate the pension agencies is not a new one, and in a Congress of patriotic citizens actuated solely by a desire to save the public money it ought not to be a difficult plan to execute; but I remember some years ago hearing a distinguished Democrat upon a public platform declare what he conceived to be the

difference between the Republican party and the Democratic party. He declared that Democracy was a faith and Republicanism an appetite. I think the justice of that characterization is borne out by the proceedings here this morning, for we find the war is confined to that side of the Chamber and that the prize is patronage. No man who has questioned the action of the Committee on Appropriations so far has said that the proposed consolidation would not work an economy, and no one has made the claim with any attempt to substantiate it that a single soldier who receives a pension would be delayed or hindered a single day or to the slightest degree by this proposed change. Therefore it results that the only reason for opposing it is found in the cohesive force of public plunder, and the cohesive force is exercised to-day upon that side of the Chamber. In order to show that this characterization is a just one I would like to read a little from the testimony of last year. I want to show the House that the only thing that makes for the solidarity of the Republican organization is patronage, and that that is well understood by the chief of the Republican party in the United States—I mean by the President of the United States—

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WANGER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. WANGER. You stated that no pensioner would be delayed a single day by reason of the consolidation of agencies. I notice on page 6 of the hearings that the Commissioner of Pensions said:

The pensioner at San Francisco might be delayed ten days or longer in getting his pension, but after that time he would get it every ninety days.

In other words, as I understand the Commissioner, there will be no delay simply because it takes ten days to reach him from the central agency, and that instead of getting his pension on the 4th of the month he will get it on the 14th, and the 14th will recur as regularly as the 4th. In other words, there will be a delay of ten days every payment, but that will be regular, and that delay more or less will exist all over the country. Is not that true?

Mr. SULLIVAN. No; the gentleman is altogether wrong, as I will proceed to point out. If he had read more, he would have reached a different conclusion, I think.

Mr. WANGER. Permit me a word more.

Mr. SULLIVAN. No; pardon me; let me finish and then I will yield later.

The gentleman has been reading the statement of the Commissioner with reference to the proposition to consolidate the eighteen agencies into one, and not his statement with reference to this proposed plan of consolidation into nine agencies. If we consolidate them all into one, and have the sole agency at Washington, then the man in San Francisco would be delayed on his first payment ten days. But that is not the plan that is under consideration, I would say to the gentleman. Under this plan the agency at San Francisco will not be disturbed, and the pensioners who receive their pay from that office will not be delayed a single day. But admitting that we went further than we propose to go here to-day, and advocated the change by consolidating all agencies into one, his statement would still be substantially true—I call the gentleman's attention to that fact—for although some pensioners in some parts of the country might be delayed ten days on the first payment, they never would be delayed after that. They would receive their pension money within three months of that first payment, and they would suffer no inconvenience beyond that.

Mr. WANGER. The difference would be that while a man would be expecting his pension on the 4th of the month he would, under consolidation into one agency at a particular point, get it on the 14th—

Mr. SULLIVAN. Oh, yes.

Mr. WANGER (continuing). Instead of the 4th.

Mr. SULLIVAN. But he would continue subsequently to get it upon the 14th, and the 14th would then be his golden day instead of the 4th. He would be looking for the 14th, and would be quite as well satisfied.

Mr. WANGER. Although his certificate would tell him to get it on the 4th?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Even so, but his common sense would tell him he would get it on the 14th.

Mr. GOULDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the subcommittee, what would be the saving in case it was consolidated into one agency—leaving out and excepting San Francisco—what would be the approximate saving in this matter? That goes to the meat of it.

Mr. SULLIVAN. That goes to the meat of a proposition we

are not discussing. That proposes a consolidation that is not before this House. We are proposing simply to cut off nine of the agencies out of the eighteen, and the one the gentleman is considering is to cut them down to one.

Mr. GOULDEN. Two.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Or two. The Commissioner of Pensions did not give us a statement of the saving effected by consolidation into one agency, but did give us a statement of the saving to be effected by the proposed consolidation into nine, and the saving would be \$104,500 annually. He stated that sixty-four clerks, at \$1,000 apiece, could be dropped in the several agencies which were discontinued. It would also save \$36,000, which would pay the salaries of nine pension agents. We would save \$4,500 a year which we are now paying as rent in New York City, temporarily.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman permit me to say that within two years they will not be paying that rent, because the new custom-house will be completed and the agency will be housed in that building?

Mr. SULLIVAN. That is all very true, but within a period far less than two years we will not pay it if the proposition goes through to-day. So, if the gentleman desires economy, he can better effect it by the route proposed by the committee than by his own.

Mr. GOULDEN. We certainly want economy, but we do not want 10,000 more pensioners in New York than in Buffalo to be put to the trouble of getting their money from Buffalo.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I will call to the gentleman's attention a statement of the Pension Commissioner, who must be admitted to be qualified to judge of this matter, that if we consolidate the two agencies in New York into one, no pensioner will be delayed a single day as a result of it, and that he will not suffer the slightest inconvenience. But what I was about to say, Mr. Chairman, was that this subject is not a new one; that it was before the Committee on Appropriations one year ago, and that a motion was made, which appears by the Record of last year, to consolidate these agencies into six. That motion was based upon the statement of the Commissioner that six agencies could do the work as well as eighteen.

When the motion was considered, it was pointed out that the consolidation could be effected by Executive order and that it did not require legislation. It was suggested then that it would be better not to commit an apparent trespass upon the prerogatives of the President by refusing to appropriate the money for the agencies, and in that manner accomplish the reduction by indirection, but would be better to consult with him and ascertain whether he would not make an order for the consolidation of these agencies, and that suggestion was acted upon. As a result one of the members of the committee called upon the President, and I read now from page 19 of last year's report a statement made to the committee by one of its members which gives the result of the conference between the President and the members of the Committee on Appropriations:

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Gentlemen, I want to say, first, in regard to the instructions of the committee last Friday, that the President was waited upon last Saturday by the Commissioner of Pensions and myself in reference to the consolidation of the pension agencies as discussed in this committee on Friday, and my impression was, and indeed he said, that he would take up the matter, but could not do it now; he was pressed too much; but later on, right after the adjournment, he would take up the matter with the Commissioner of Pensions and give to the whole subject very careful consideration, with a view of reducing the number of pension agencies.

There we have complete evidence that the matter was presented to the President by a member of the Appropriations Committee and by the Pension Commissioner, the Commissioner going very soon after making his statement to the Appropriations Committee that these agencies should be consolidated and twelve of them dropped, leaving six to administer the function. Unquestionably, although I would not have the hardihood to say what the President heard and what the President said, and to quote the conversation that was reported, I will say this: That undoubtedly the Commissioner of Pensions pressed upon the President the expediency of reducing the agencies to six. The President promised to take the matter up after the adjournment of Congress. We adjourned last July. The President had it in his power every day since last July, by Executive order, to consolidate these agencies. The President has failed to do it; and this year the Commissioner of Pensions comes before the committee once more and renews his proposition to consolidate these agencies, and he repeats his testimony of one year ago, that these agencies can be reduced to nine and even to six.

Now, then, I assert, Mr. Chairman, that the failure of the President to effect this saving of about \$100,000, in a case brought directly to his attention, is a recognition upon his part, as head of the Republican party, that patronage is the sole

principle upon which the Republican party has maintained its organization.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I will.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts does the President an injustice. I do not like to quote on the floor of the House what the President has said or said at that time; but I will undertake the responsibility of saying this: That he then said substantially, "I am ready to do anything that the Commissioner of Pensions will recommend;" and I think he stands ready to do that now; but the reinforcement of an affirmative vote of this House would not only manifest to the President, but to the country, that the House is willing to forego some patronage as well as the President.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the gentleman, I think his analysis of the President's motives is entirely wrong; and I will proceed to point out wherein I think it is wrong. I will call his attention to a fact which is well known in this country, that the President does not usually wait in deference upon the Congress, but when he has fixed ideas which he likes to see crystallized into law he does not hesitate long in sending a vigorous message to Congress, and supplementing it with as many messages as he deems necessary to bring Congress to his way of thinking.

If the President were convinced, as he must have been convinced by the Commissioner of Pensions, of the necessity of effecting this economy, and he felt that it would not do violence to a sacred principle of the Republican party to effect this change himself, he would have framed an Executive order accomplishing all that the Congress could accomplish by legislation. It would have been a virtuous act on the part of the President, for which he would have been entitled to the whole credit, but which now it seems he is simply asked to share with Congress. Usually, when the President can perform a meritorious act alone and without the aid of Congress, he does not hesitate to do so.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow another interruption?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I wish that politics might not be brought into this discussion, for only a purely business principle is involved; but is it not true that the last Democratic President of the United States issued an Executive order to abolish nine of these pension agencies; only in issuing the order he dated the time of its taking effect after the expiration of his term of office?

Mr. SULLIVAN. That is true, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. So that even a Democratic President has a little idea of what patronage may be while he is in office.

Mr. SULLIVAN. That is true, Mr. Chairman. I have no idea that Republicans alone have an idea of the value of patronage. I think they could not get along without patronage as well as the Democratic party has got along. I think they appreciate the value of it more than the Democratic party does; but let me supplement the gentleman's statement by saying that this virtuous action of a Democratic Executive in abolishing these agencies was rendered of no effect, because President McKinley canceled the order when he came into office, showing clearly that even a virtuous action of a Democratic President which might effect an economy was simply intolerable from the Republican standpoint. [Applause on Democratic side.]

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I only want to suggest, if the gentleman will allow me, that the distinguished President, Mr. Cleveland, did not want the order to operate during his Administration, when he might have applied it, but simply wanted to teach the Republicans in the future administration how to be economical and how to restrict their patronage.

Mr. SULLIVAN. That may or may not be so, but the action of President McKinley and of President Roosevelt showed that they did not want it under any circumstances. That is the difference. Now, if President Roosevelt really thought that this economy should be effected in the interest of the taxpayers of the United States there would be no need of this discussion. He could frame an Executive order dropping these agencies to-day. He would not have to wait until this recommendation of the Appropriations Committee passed through this House, passed through the struggle which it must encounter here at the hands of the friends of patronage upon that side of the Chamber, and then wait and watch its devious course through the upper Chamber after it emerges from this one. By a single stroke of the pen he could save the people of this country \$100,000, but he prefers to have Congress do it. I ask

the gentleman from Michigan, why does he prefer to have Congress do it? I will answer that question, and then the gentleman may modify or qualify my answer or comment on it as he pleases; but my own opinion is that he chooses to put upon Congress the responsibility for reducing the opportunity for Republican patronage.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I would say that I have no knowledge, direct or indirect, hearsay or otherwise, that the President has spoken, directly or by intimation, to the effect that he desires Congress to take any action upon this subject. He said to me a few days ago—I do not like to refer to private conversations with the President, but this seems to be necessary—he said, “I will do what the Pension Commissioner recommends;” not what the Congress recommends, but what the Pension Commissioner recommends, and I think we ought to absolve the President of the United States from playing politics in a thing of this kind.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish that we could, but when a President is sworn to enforce laws and guard the people's money, and has the power by a single stroke of the pen to execute an economy which will save \$100,000 then I assert that politics is not being played upon this end of the Avenue. If the money ought to be saved, and the President has the power to save it, why should he wait for the action of Congress? Did he wait for the action of Congress when he framed Executive Order 78, concerning which there were grave doubts as to his constitutional power? There are no such doubts here. He has the power under the statutes to effect this economy. Last year it was a subject of debate upon this floor, and a resolution was offered to test the validity of Executive Order No. 78; but by the narrow margin of three votes this House avoided an investigation of the validity of the President's order, although the House had a Republican majority of more than thirty. I simply point to that as an illustration of the fact that there were grave doubts on both sides of the Chamber of the validity under the Constitution of the action of the President of the United States. He then exercised a doubtful power, which led to increased expenditure. He now refrains from exercising an undoubted power in the interest of economy. But we are dealing now with a question that presents no such difficulties. The President's course is clear. He has the right under the law to effect this economy, and in order to show that I am entirely right in criticising the President's neglect I will read again from the statement of the gentleman from Michigan made to the Appropriations Committee and printed in the Record. He purports to give the result of conversations between the President and the Commissioner of Pensions and himself and uses this language:

The President was waited upon Saturday by the Commissioner of Pensions and myself in reference to the consolidation of the pension agencies, as discussed in this committee on Friday. My impression was, and, indeed, he said—

Now, the gentleman undertakes to quote what the President said, and he has stated what he said in the report that he made to the committee of which he was a member—

he said that he would take up the matter.

If he intended Congress to act upon it, would it be necessary to tell the gentleman that he would take up the matter? What could he have meant by using the language, “I will take up that matter” but that he, by Executive order, would effect this economy?

If he intended not to take up the matter, he would have said to the gentleman from Michigan, “I prefer not to take the responsibility upon myself. I prefer that your committee recommend this change and the Congress accept the responsibility for this departure.” But he preferred to take another attitude on the question, and he used other language indicative of that purpose. He must have said: “I will take up this matter. I have not the time now; I am pressed.” He was pressed with the railroad-rate bill and other bills pending in this body; but after adjournment he would take up the matter with the Commissioner of Pensions and go through the whole subject, and give it careful consideration.

The President of the United States came into public notice as a reformer, a vaunted reformer of the civil service in this country. He owed whatever political fame he enjoyed in his early days to the fact that he advocated economy in the administration of public affairs, and clinging to that principle, as he is reported in the press of the country, he has gained step by step the higher offices, until now he is in the office of the President of the United States, where he has more power to effect reforms in the civil service in one minute of the day than he had years ago when he was day and night advocating these reforms; and yet, with the subject brought to his attention by a responsi-

ble officer in charge of the Bureau, with the clear statement before him that by a single stroke of the pen he could save \$100,000 of the people's money, he has allowed that power to lie unused for a whole year, and then attempts to throw the responsibility of the change upon Congress. Now, I submit to the intelligent audience here if there could be any other possible interpretation of the President's motives than that? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the statement read from the minutes of last year is strictly accurate as I recollect that interview. There was no secretary present to take any minutes, no one but the Commissioner of Pensions and myself. Now, whether or not the Commissioner of Pensions called the President's attention to this I do not know, but it would not be a surprising thing, with the very large responsibilities, with the exacting duties and the many demands made upon the President's time, that this might have been overlooked unless his attention was especially called to it.

Again, I want to repeat what I said, that there has never been any intimation by the President, directly or indirectly, that he desired, as far as I know, to shirk any responsibility in this matter. He is not a man who shirks his duty upon another person or body. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman on the other side may be content with that explanation, but I shall submit this question in all candor. If the President of the United States, knowing of the necessity of this change, failed to exercise the power which he possesses, is he not clearly open to the criticism that the purpose of submitting the proposition to effect that change to Congress must be to put the responsibility for the change upon that body? Will the gentleman from Michigan tell me of any one other motive which will explain his conduct in the premises?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I do not think in a matter of this kind it is necessary to go into the motives of a man. That is pretty farfetched, and I fear the gentleman has traversed very closely to that dangerous edge. It is a dangerous thing to stand here and challenge the motives of any man, much less the President of the United States.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Oh, Mr. Chairman, there is no such thing as the crime of lèse-majesté in this free Republic, I will remind the gentleman. I am fully aware of the meaning of my words, and I accept full responsibility for them. I have no fear of criticising the motives of the President of the United States any more than I would have of criticising the motives of any other individual in the United States. I have that right in this Chamber, I submit, and if I choose to exercise it, the only limitations that shall be put upon me are that I shall do it in a courteous manner and shall not exceed the proprieties of debate and shall cling to the facts of the case. I submit that I have done all three, that I have not exceeded any of those limitations, and that I am entirely within my rights. I can not retract a single word that I have said. I repeat that there must have been a motive for the failure to act, and rather than discuss it further, because I think it has been discussed enough, I leave it to the House to decide as a matter of conscience with each Member, if he decides to make examination, whether the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GARDNER] is right in his interpretation of the President's attitude or whether I am right.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Does the gentleman know whether or not these agencies were created by act of Congress or by Executive order originally?

Mr. SULLIVAN. No; I do not. I can not answer that question.

Mr. KEIFER. My impression is that they were never created by Congress, but were generally provided for by law and fixed by order originally—away back.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, and that is if these economies in regard to clerk hire are possible under a consolidation of offices, why are they not possible if made without consolidation? The bulk of the saving is by the reduction of clerk hire—\$64,000, estimated. Can not this reduction be just as well made by the Commissioner of Pensions without reference to a consolidation?

Mr. SULLIVAN. No; I think not.

Mr. GRAHAM. I can not see why.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Oh, I think the gentleman leaves out one element in the calculation. To illustrate, take the three New England agencies, Boston, Augusta, and Concord. Two of those three agencies now pay at the same time, the same months, and one at another time. If those three agencies were made into one, the time of payment in one of them, say, for example, the Boston agency, could be changed, and then the pensioners in

Maine and in New Hampshire and in Massachusetts would receive their checks at different periods from what they do now. Checks would go out to some part of that entire district each month, and the clerks, the smaller number of clerks, in the consolidated agency would be employed in certain months of each year where they are not employed now. They now send these checks out once every three months, and there does not appear to be a great deal of work for them to do in the intervals between those payments; but by consolidating three into one and making the dates of payment come each month, the clerks could be employed each month. Let me illustrate further, for a moment. Augusta, Me., pays in March, June, September, and December, and Concord pays in January, April, July, and October. That takes up eight months of the year. Boston pays as Augusta does, in March, June, September, and December. By changing the dates of the Boston payment to February, May, August, and November that agency would send out these pay checks once each month, and the clerks could be employed constantly. In the same manner the same system could be applied in the other consolidated agencies throughout the country, and the clerks could be kept employed where they are now idle in these intervals of payment.

Mr. GRAHAM. I see the force of the gentleman's argument, but I can not see why it can not be accomplished in another way by having temporary clerks. Take the Pittsburg agency, for example. A certain number are employed all the year round, and then when these payments are made an additional force is called in just for a month, or so many weeks—I think it is a month that they employ them. Why could not the department do the same thing in the interim, discharge a number of these clerks and just employ extra help during the time that the exigency of the case demands?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Undoubtedly the department might do that, but it is a question of making a large economy or a small economy. It would be better for the head of the department to save a dollar where he could rather than to save 50 cents, and by consolidating these agencies he would save much more than he would by appointing temporary clerks, to say nothing of the danger with which we are all familiar, that the temporary clerk soon becomes a permanent one.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to his colleague?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I do.

Mr. WEEKS. I would like to ask my colleague a question. I notice in this bill an appropriation of \$4,000 a year each for nine agents. I presume that is the salary paid to all agents now.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. WEEKS. There are eighteen agents, which would make \$72,000. Now, if all those agencies were abolished, I would like to ask my colleague if there would not be a saving of \$72,000 on that question alone?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Of \$68,000, because we would get rid of seventeen of those agencies, and that brings me to a discussion of the proposition which some gentlemen have brought forward here to-day of making one agency instead of eighteen. I am not sure that some of the gentlemen have brought it forward in good faith. I think perhaps they have advanced it in order to kill the proposed consolidation into nine, knowing very well that a proposition to consolidate eighteen into one would have a slim chance of passage in this House. I doubt if it could pass this House, but I see no reason on the merits of the case why we should not consolidate eighteen into one. There is a legislative difficulty, but there ought not to be any difficulty in principle. It is admitted by all who have studied the subject, notably by the Commissioner, that the pensioners throughout the country would not be delayed after the first payment if all the checks were sent out from one department in the city of Washington, and that a vast number of clerks could be dispensed with.

The only objection from the Commissioner's standpoint is that there is no building available for the housing of the clerks who would be brought here, and I, with all due respect to the Commissioner, do not think that objection has disposed of the argument in favor of consolidating into one. We are told that we could save sixty-four clerks by consolidating eighteen agencies into nine. The Commissioner's secretary being asked how many clerks we could dispense with if they consolidated into one replied that we could save the same amount. Well, that does not seem to me to follow. If we can save sixty-four by dropping nine agencies, we could save many more, if not an equal number, by dropping eight of the remaining nine agencies, and I have not the slightest doubt we could save at least a hundred thousand dollars in clerk hire and \$68,000 in the salaries

of pension agents by having the Department transact all the business in the city of Washington. If we had not the building, I think it would be economy to hire one temporarily and effect this saving.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Will the gentleman permit a question? Does the gentleman know just what was the proposition put up to the President on the question—whether to reduce from eighteen to nine or from eighteen to one?

Mr. SULLIVAN. No; I do not.

Mr. DRISCOLL. You do not know but that if we do not reduce these agencies to nine the President may reduce them to one?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I suppose the President may do it. I would be glad to have him carry his power that far.

Mr. DRISCOLL. You do not know whether the suggestion was made to the President at that time to reduce the number from eighteen to nine or from eighteen to one?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I do not know, but the proposition before the committee was to consolidate into nine or six. The visit to the President was for the purpose of discussing the question of consolidation, and I do not know whether he discussed it upon the proposition to reduce it to nine or six or one, but I assume, and I do not think it is a violent assumption, that there was a discussion of the proposition to reduce it either to nine or six.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Massachusetts permit me—

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. OLMSTED. To ask if he knows what President created these 18 pension agencies?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, I have already stated I do not know whether they were created by order of the President or by act of law.

Mr. OLMSTED. I will call his attention to the act of March 3, 1885, which is as follows:

The President is authorized to establish agencies for the payment of pensions whenever in his judgment the public interests and the convenience of the pensioners require, but the number of pension agencies in any State or Territory shall in no case be increased hereafter to exceed three.

That is, not more than three in any one State. I read this simply to disabuse the gentleman's mind of the idea that this was for the benefit of Republican patronage. This was the last act of an expiring Republican Administration—the act was approved by a Republican President on the very last day of his term—authorizing a Democratic President, who was to be sworn in the next day, to establish these 18 pension agencies. That would benefit his own patronage, not Republican patronage.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I would like to correct the gentleman's impression by citing a later chapter of history, namely, that in the last Democratic Administration the Democratic President issued an order for the consolidation of the 18 agencies into 9, which order was revoked by his successor, who was a Republican President.

Mr. OLMSTED. After he had created the 18 agencies and appointed the 18 agents he desired to abolish them, so as to prevent his successor from having the same privilege.

Mr. DALZELL. And when he was going out he did it.

Mr. SULLIVAN. His successor, not at all impressed with his act, with the principle of economy, refused to consolidate the agencies.

Mr. DALZELL. Will the gentleman allow me? The order made by the Democratic President was made expressly to take effect after he went out of office and when the Republican President came in.

Mr. SULLIVAN. That is true; and the only criticism I would make of President Cleveland in that direction is that he seemed to possess too much faith in the virtue of a Republican Administration. [Laughter.]

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HAMILTON having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. LATTA, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

On January 18:

H. R. 14811. An act to authorize George T. Houston and Frank B. Houston to construct and operate an electric railway over the national cemetery road at Vicksburg, Miss.;

H. R. 19754. An act to provide for the distribution of public documents to the library of the Philippine government at Manila, P. I.; and

H. R. 24478. An act for the relief of citizens of the island of Jamaica.

On January 19:

H. R. 19523. An act to authorize Thomas J. Ewing and George B. Patton, of Catlettsburg, Ky.; Otto Burger, of Cincinnati, Ohio; Herbert Haynard, of Kenova, W. Va., and Charles Miller, of Huntington, W. Va., to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River.

On January 21:

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution to fill a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution;

H. R. 13675. An act to ratify and confirm the acts of the legislative assembly of the Territory of Oklahoma, passed in the year 1905, relating to an insane asylum for the Territory of Oklahoma, and providing for the establishment and maintenance of an insane asylum for the Territory of Oklahoma at Fort Supply, in Woodward County, Okla., and making appropriations therefor;

H. R. 20069. An act for the opening of Macomb street NW., District of Columbia;

H. R. 1249. An act granting a pension to William R. Fulk;

H. R. 1372. An act granting a pension to Josephine I. Richmond;

H. R. 1500. An act granting a pension to Emily J. Shermar;

H. R. 1800. An act granting a pension to Eliza J. Ingle;

H. R. 4705. An act granting a pension to Harriet E. Palmer;

H. R. 10789. An act granting a pension to David Wilborn;

H. R. 18677. An act granting a pension to Martin Alphons Luther;

H. R. 522. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick Roschdiantzky;

H. R. 562. An act granting an increase of pension to John F. Mohn;

H. R. 600. An act granting an increase of pension to Oliver N. McLain;

H. R. 747. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert Smith;

H. R. 1026. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Wilcox;

H. R. 1060. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Lounsbury;

H. R. 1067. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob Bender;

H. R. 1068. An act granting an increase of pension to William S. Quigley;

H. R. 1169. An act granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Pierce;

H. R. 1673. An act granting an increase of pension to Jennie E. Edson;

H. R. 1687. An act granting an increase of pension to James C. Daly;

H. R. 1706. An act granting an increase of pension to George H. Washburn;

H. R. 1709. An act granting an increase of pension to Brice P. Munns;

H. R. 1891. An act granting an increase of pension to Simeon York;

H. R. 1904. An act granting an increase of pension to Nelson R. Satterlee;

H. R. 1938. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Foutty;

H. R. 2290. An act granting an increase of pension to Peter Reedy;

H. R. 2422. An act granting an increase of pension to Earl K. Childs;

H. R. 2761. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Mahoney;

H. R. 2822. An act granting an increase of pension to Levi Gates;

H. R. 2909. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob T. Wise;

H. R. 3194. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Harvey;

H. R. 3195. An act granting an increase of pension to Milton S. Collins;

H. R. 3228. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Doyle;

H. R. 3234. An act granting an increase of pension to Rush Deskines;

H. R. 3297. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Lonergan;

H. R. 3355. An act granting an increase of pension to James L. Allen;

H. R. 3494. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert A. Talham;

H. R. 3496. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward Walton;

H. R. 3733. An act granting an increase of pension to Simeon D. Chelf;

H. R. 4386. An act granting an increase of pension to Zelinda E. Odenbaugh;

H. R. 4648. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Dedrick;

H. R. 4656. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Snell;

H. R. 4663. An act granting an increase of pension to Horace B. Tanner;

H. R. 4834. An act granting an increase of pension to Silas W. White;

H. R. 6911. An act granting an increase of pension to William J. Turner;

H. R. 7476. An act granting an increase of pension to George C. Dean;

H. R. 7488. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob L. Hatton;

H. R. 8563. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Hays;

H. R. 8789. An act granting an increase of pension to Levi Chapman;

H. R. 10364. An act granting an increase of pension to John P. Patterson;

H. R. 10531. An act granting an increase of pension to William G. Binkley;

H. R. 10751. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Harris;

H. R. 10755. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna Flynn;

H. R. 10804. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Worley;

H. R. 10958. An act granting an increase of pension to Levi Dodson;

H. R. 12911. An act granting an increase of pension to Ambrose S. Delaware;

H. R. 13241. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis Haner;

H. R. 13455. An act granting an increase of pension to Josiah P. Higgins;

H. R. 13887. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph T. Eagler;

H. R. 14298. An act granting an increase of pension to John Remick;

H. R. 14543. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Barnell, alias Richard North;

H. R. 15004. An act granting an increase of pension to William J. McAtee;

H. R. 15471. An act granting an increase of pension to Eli Stover;

H. R. 15763. An act granting an increase of pension to Gainford N. Upton;

H. R. 18454. An act granting an increase of pension to Barlow Davis;

H. R. 18742. An act granting an increase of pension to Martin V. Barney;

H. R. 19296. An act granting an increase of pension to Assov Harelson;

H. R. 19390. An act granting an increase of pension to William R. Sears;

H. R. 19482. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Cannell;

H. R. 19725. An act granting an increase of pension to Howard Bennett;

H. R. 19970. An act granting an increase of pension to Eugene Demers;

H. R. 20559. An act granting an increase of pension to John Bradley;

H. R. 20617. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. S. Will;

H. R. 20623. An act granting an increase of pension to James B. O. Horbach;

H. R. 20714. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert Turley;

H. R. 20891. An act granting an increase of pension to Hugh Blair;

H. R. 20968. An act granting an increase of pension to Waitman T. Mathers;

H. R. 21578. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Gaskey;

H. R. 19035. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Moore Morgan;

H. R. 19462. An act granting an increase of pension to Emily Fox;

H. R. 19528. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Maddox; and

H. R. 16169. An act granting a pension to Neal O'Donnell Parks.

On January 22:

H. R. 8631. An act for the relief of James M. Darling;

H. R. 3357. An act granting an honorable discharge to James B. Mulford;

H. R. 121. An act authorizing the extension of Seventeenth street NW.;

H. R. 128. An act for the opening of a connecting highway between Water Side drive and Park road, District of Columbia;

H. R. 8435. An act for the opening of Fessenden street NW., District of Columbia;

H. R. 10843. An act authorizing the extension of Kenyon street NW.;

H. R. 14815. An act for the extension of Harvard street, Columbia Heights, District of Columbia;

H. R. 14900. An act to extend Fourth street NE.; and

S. 6578. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1895, and to amend an act amendatory thereof approved June 20, 1906.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour or so much more time as he may find necessary to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, it has been said in certain of the newspapers of the country that I was about to proceed to make a farewell address to the House of Representatives. I have no doubt that some of my colleagues on this side of the House and some of my friends on the other side of the House would be equally glad if that were a true statement; but it is not. I do not intend to make a farewell address now or at any other time. I do not intend by any intimation that I shall make here to bar myself from being heard during the coming month of February on any important question for the speaking upon which I may be recognized by the presiding officer. [Applause.] Nor do I intend to bar my way to any seat that I may occupy hereafter in the Senate of the United States or in any of the other great bodies, such as the Civil Service Commission. [Laughter.] Or any body of that high character.

Mr. OLMSTED. Or the Cabinet?

Mr. OLCOTT. Or President?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I desire to speak on a phase of the tariff question. It is a new question in Congress somewhat, at least in the form in which I propose to put it. I am shortly going out of public life, and I feel it my duty, wherever it is possible for me to do so, to leave behind me light-houses and buoys and trees blazed and marks upon the ground warning the people of the country against the dangers that crowd so thickly upon the people of the country situated like ours. And the particular warning that I propose to give now is to try to show that it would be recklessness and indiscretion upon the part of the people of the country to take for granted and as true any statement connected with the tariff question that might come from any Democrat or any organization of Democrats. And I propose to point out the reasons why.

Nothing which I shall say will be a reflection upon the integrity and honor and patriotic purpose of the Democratic party or its members. It is unnecessary for me to say that I have the highest regard and appreciation—I emphasize the last word—of the patience, perseverance, and continual wrongdoing of the Democratic party of my country upon this question, and I propose to apply the history of the tariff question as it has fallen under my observation as an illustration and demonstration of what I have to say.

I will not go back except to briefly state that since I have been a Member of Congress we have had the tariff question in a great many forms. We had the Morrison bill, which was a product of Democratic statesmanship, and which was supported with enthusiasm and faith and hope by the Democrats in the House and in the Senate and in the country. The author of that bill still lives, honored and esteemed by his countrymen without regard to party. I will not go into any details in regard to that measure. Subsequently there came the Mills bill, an intelligent movement in the direction of free trade, advocated by some of the ablest men on this floor at that time; and some of the arguments made at that time impressed me with great

force. I remember the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Mills, the chairman of the committee, emphasizing this proposition, namely, that you must buy from foreign countries or foreign countries will not buy from you. And that was the burden of his song. It was the strongest argument put forward, and it made an impression upon my mind that more than staggered for the time being my faith in the principle of protection for protection. His idea was that trade in the productions of industry was and is a matter of sentiment and good fellowship; that unless we love the other fellow we will not buy his goods and will buy from some one who stands better in the matter of sentimentality than the other, and this regardless of the character of the goods or their prices.

This idea has much to do with many aspects of the subject of reciprocity.

Since that time I have learned to discern that there is nothing whatever in that argument, and I have reached the conclusion, which I think all intelligent men have reached, in the light of the history of the past ten or twelve years, that Nations buy where they can buy the cheapest and the best, utterly regardless of the question of the sales to any other Nation. I do not believe the fact that we manufacture all of our pig iron, or substantially all of it, has ever entered the mind of a single British merchant. Trade is selfish; commerce is pure selfishness; there is no sentiment in it, and the record of the past ten years abundantly demonstrates that fact. So that the Mills bill neither affected the condition of the country one way or the other, except that we were plodding along and doing the best that we could.

The next bill I shall speak upon is the McKinley law. That was a bill framed, not as a high protective measure, but it was framed to meet the changes in large part that had taken place by the exigencies of the shifting conditions growing out of lapse of time and the changes of commercial relations between countries. The McKinley bill had an unfortunate beginning. It began so late in the summer of the year following its introduction and passage that the country misinterpreted it and a revolution, potential and powerful at the time, swept over the country and brought us the Fifty-third Congress.

I do not care to discuss the McKinley tariff law, for the line of argument which I propose to submit is not involved in the benefit or detriment that the law inflicted on the country. It is enough to say that the Democratic Administration made haste to wipe it off the statute books, and carried the election of 1892 upon that issue and with a pledge to that course. It was a law framed for the promotion of trade among the countries of the world, and it was a law framed to meet certain of the necessities and certain of the growing and new developments of trade in this country. I might turn aside, as it is in the line of my argument, to say that from one end of the country to another there was a universal claim upon the part of the Democrats, which seemed to have its origin here in the House, and spread throughout the country, that we could not—those were the words used—we could not produce, for instance, the article of tin plate in the United States. It was an astounding statement, and it was made with vigor and earnestness, and apparently in absolutely good faith. It was made everywhere—on the stump, in the press, and in the halls of Congress. It impressed the people with the argument.

I need not elaborate upon it that one of the greatest industries of the country and the one that is most far-reaching in its effects upon foreign commerce to-day is the manufacture of tin plate to the inhabitants of the country. I might point out the fact of the price of tin plate in the country to-day and the prices that they were at the time of the passage of the McKinley law testifies to the beneficial effect of a protective tariff in the development of an industry and the creation of competition, so that the tin plate purchased to-day in this country for the use of the people is at a price less than two-thirds of the price we were paying in those days; and we are exporting enormous quantities to foreign countries. And in this way great benefits have inured to every consumer of tin plate in this country and brought new avenues to profitable employment of tens of thousands of workmen and their families. And alike it brought benefit to all other branches of business.

But the law was repealed and the Wilson tariff law took its place. The passage in this house was the event which brought great joy to the Democrats here and in the country and in Europe.

Now it is often said by our enemies—and said with a great deal of force and a great deal of apparent effect sometimes—that the condition of the country was not materially affected by the introduction of the Wilson tariff bill and its passage and enforcement. I am not going to spend any great amount of time upon this proposition, but I make this statement: What Demo-

crat is there, living or dead, who ever gave any reason for the conditions of the people in this country between 1892 and 1897 that did not attribute them to the operations of the tariff law known as the "Wilson law?" If not that law, then what did it?

Well, I will tell you what they say. They deny it. They say it had no effect; and my friend, if he will permit me, for I expect to deal with some of his arguments that have not always been made in the House of Representatives; I refer to the eloquent gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. I will say this, and I think I will make my argument based upon the statement of his argument. He says hard times began in 1892. That is true. But the day after election the price of labor in this country began to go down, and it went down to the condition of things we had in 1897. But he says the Wilson tariff bill was not passed until 1894, therefore how could the Wilson tariff bill have affected the country? It will not be forgotten that the Democratic party made its fight of 1892 on distinct opposition to the McKinley law and all it contained. It pledged itself to the repeal of that act, and it was not a far cry from the platform and election to the certainty of the repeal and substitution which came as the necessary outcome of the apparent popular verdict.

But the argument is this: The election of 1892 happened in November. The first session of the Fifty-third Congress did not begin until December, 1893. The Wilson bill did not pass and become a law until July, 1894. Hence that bill did not produce the terrible conditions in the country which began in November, 1892, and swept like a fire in dry grass all over the country and swept away a great per cent of the value of the real and personal property of the country. That is the claim, and literally that is true. But how much force is there in the admission? The Democratic party is the author of the platform of 1892; it carried the country, and the result of the legislation was felt in advance and grew worse after the passage of the Wilson bill.

But the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] puts it this way. He gives us some very beautiful illustrations. I remember one of them. For instance, he says Napoleon had the itch at Tours—I believe I have the wrong word.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Toulon.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Ah, yes; Toulon. I thank the gentleman for the correction. Napoleon lost the battle of Waterloo. "Did the fact that he had the itch at Toulon cause the loss of the battle of Waterloo?" That is a good Democratic argument, and it is about on a dead level with the weight of Democratic arguments generally upon this particular question. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Two propositions must be borne in mind, that the downward condition of things in this country began instantly upon the election of Cleveland and a Democratic Senate and House. The burden of proof is upon the Democrats to give us an understanding of what did cause the trouble. Mr. Gompers, whom I do not often quote as an authority, says that in 1896—possibly he says in 1895—there were 3,000,000 idle men in the United States. Mr. Harrison, in the fall of 1892, said there was scarcely one, and I shall put in the RECORD an extract from his message, in which he congratulates the country upon the splendid conditions of labor and capital and industries at the close of his connection with the Government in December, 1892, when Congress assembled. No controversy was ever made about that. Nobody every contradicted the force or truthfulness or fairness of his statement.

[Fourth annual message.]

EXECUTIVE MANSION, December 6, 1892.

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

In submitting my annual message to Congress I have great satisfaction in being able to say that the general conditions affecting the commercial and industrial interests of the United States are in the highest degree favorable. A comparison of the existing conditions with those of the most-favored period in the history of the country will, I believe, show that so high a degree of prosperity and so general a diffusion of the comforts of life were never before enjoyed by our people.

The total wealth of the country in 1890 was \$16,159,616,068. In 1890 it amounted to \$62,610,000,000, an increase of 287 per cent.

The total mileage of railways in the United States in 1860 was 30,626. In 1890 it was 167,741, an increase of 448 per cent; and it is estimated that there will be about 4,000 miles of track added by the close of the year 1892.

The official returns of the Eleventh Census and those of the Tenth Census for seventy-five leading cities furnish the basis for the following comparisons:

In 1880 the capital invested in manufacturing was \$1,232,839,670.
In 1890 the capital invested in manufacturing was \$2,900,735,884.
In 1880 the number of employees was 1,301,388.
In 1890 the number of employees was 2,251,134.
In 1880 the wages earned were \$501,965,778.
In 1890 the wages earned were \$1,221,170,454.
In 1880 the value of the product was \$2,711,579,899.

In 1890 the value of the product was \$4,860,286,837.

I am informed by the Superintendent of the Census that the omission of certain industries in 1880 which were included in 1890 accounts in part for the remarkable increase thus shown; but after making full allowance for differences of method and deducting the returns for all industries not included in the census of 1880 there remain in the reports from these seventy-five cities an increase in the capital employed of \$1,522,745,004. In the value of the product of \$2,024,236,166, in wages earned of \$677,943,929, and in the number of wage-earners employed of 856,029. The wage earnings not only show an increased aggregate, but an increase per capita from \$386 in 1880 to \$547 in 1890, or 41.71 per cent.

The new industrial plants established since October 6, 1890, and up to October 22, 1892, as partially reported in the American Economist, number 345, and the extension of existing plants, 108; the new capital invested amounts to \$40,449,050 and the number of additional employees to 37,285.

The Textile World for July, 1892, states that during the first six months of the present calendar year 135 new factories were built, of which 40 are cotton mills, 48 knitting mills, 26 woolen mills, 15 silk mills, 4 plush mills, and 2 linen mills. Of the 40 cotton mills, 21 have been built in the Southern States. Mr. A. B. Shepperson, of the New York Cotton Exchange, estimates the number of working spindles in the United States on September 1, 1892, at 15,200,000, an increase of 660,000 over the year 1891. The consumption of cotton by American mills in 1891 was 2,396,000 bales, and in 1892, 2,584,000 bales, an increase of 188,000 bales. From the year 1869 to 1892, inclusive, there has been an increase in the consumption of cotton in Europe of 92 per cent, while during the same period the increased consumption in the United States has been about 150 per cent.

The report of Ira Ayer, special agent of the Treasury Department, shows that at the date of September 30, 1892, there were thirty-two companies manufacturing tin andterne plate in the United States and fourteen companies building new works for such manufacture. The estimated investment in buildings and plants at the close of the fiscal year June 30, 1893, if existing conditions were to be continued, was \$5,000,000, and the estimated rate of production 200,000,000 pounds per annum. The actual production for the quarter ending September 30, 1892, was 10,952,725 pounds.

The report of Labor Commissioner Peck, of New York, shows that during the year 1891, in about 6,000 manufacturing establishments in that State embraced within the special inquiry made by him, and representing 67 different industries, there was a net increase over the year 1890 of \$31,315,130.68 in the value of the product and of \$6,377,925.09 in the amount of wages paid. The report of the commissioner of labor for the State of Massachusetts shows that 3,745 industries in that State paid \$129,416,248 in wages during the year 1891, against \$126,030,303 in 1890, an increase of \$3,335,945, and that there was an increase of \$9,932,490 in the amount of capital and of 7,346 in the number of persons employed in the same period.

During the last six months of the year 1891 and the first six months of 1892 the total production of pig iron was 9,710,819 tons, as against 9,202,703 tons in the year 1890, which was the largest annual production ever attained. For the same twelve months of 1891-92 the production of Bessemer ingots was 3,878,581 tons, an increase of 189,710 gross tons over the previously unprecedented yearly production of 3,688,871 gross tons in 1890. The production of Bessemer steel rails for the first six months of 1892 was 772,436 gross tons, as against 702,080 gross tons during the last six months of the year 1891.

The total value of our foreign trade (exports and imports of merchandise) during the last fiscal year was \$1,857,680,610, an increase of \$128,283,604 over the previous fiscal year. The average annual value of our imports and exports of merchandise for the ten fiscal years prior to 1891 was \$1,457,322,019. It will be observed that our foreign trade for 1892 exceeded this annual average value by \$400,358,591, an increase of 27.47 per cent. The significance and value of this increase are shown by the fact that the excess in the trade of 1892 over 1891 was wholly in the value of exports, for there was a decrease in the value of imports of \$17,513,754.

The value of our exports during the fiscal year 1892 reached the highest figure in the history of the Government, amounting to \$1,030,278,148, exceeding by \$145,797,338 the exports of 1891 and exceeding the value of the imports by \$202,875,686. A comparison of the value of our exports for 1892 with the annual average for the ten years prior to 1891 shows an excess of \$265,142,651, or 34.65 per cent. The value of our imports of merchandise for 1892, which was \$829,402, also exceeded the annual average value of the ten years prior to 1891 by \$135,215,940. During the fiscal year 1892 the value of imports free of duty amounted to \$457,999,658, the largest aggregate in the history of our commerce. The value of the imports of merchandise entered free of duty in 1892 was 55.35 per cent of the total value of imports, as compared with 43.35 per cent in 1891 and 33.66 per cent in 1890.

In our coastwise trade a most encouraging development is in progress, there having been in the last four years an increase of 16 per cent. In internal commerce the statistics show that no such period of prosperity has ever before existed. The freight carried in the coastwise trade of the Great Lakes in 1890 aggregated 28,295,959 tons. On the Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio rivers and tributaries in the same year the traffic aggregated 29,405,046 tons, and the total vessel tonnage passing through the Detroit River during that year was 21,684,000 tons. The vessel tonnage entered and cleared in the foreign trade of London during 1890 amounted to 13,450,767 tons, and of Liverpool 10,941,800 tons, a total for these two great shipping ports of 24,422,568 tons, only slightly in excess of the vessel tonnage passing through the Detroit River. And it should be said that the season for the Detroit River was but 228 days, while of course in London and Liverpool the season was for the entire year. The vessel tonnage passing through St. Mary's Canal for the fiscal year 1892 amounted to 9,828,874 tons; and the freight tonnage of the Detroit River is estimated for that year at 25,000,000 tons, against 23,209,619 tons in 1891. The aggregate traffic on our railroads for the year 1891 amounted to 704,398,609 tons of freight compared with 691,344,437 tons in 1890, an increase of 13,054,172 tons.

Another indication of the general prosperity of the country is found in the fact that the number of depositors in savings banks increased from 693,870 in 1860 to 4,258,893 in 1890, an increase of 513 per cent, and the amount of deposits from \$149,277,504 in 1860 to \$1,524,844,506 in 1890, an increase of 921 per cent. In 1891 the amount of deposits in savings banks was \$1,623,079,749. It is estimated that 90 per cent of these deposits represent the savings of wage-earners. The bank

clearances for nine months ending September 30, 1891, amounted to \$41,049,390,808. For the same months in 1892 they amounted to \$45,180,601,947, an excess for the nine months of \$4,140,211,139.

So I say that, driven to the necessity of admitting the good condition of the country in 1892, driven to admit the terrible condition of the country in 1896, the burden is upon the Democrat who justifies the changes in our legislation to show what it was that caused the changed conditions. Oh, I know what they will say. They will say there was not money enough in the country. I will put into my speech a statement showing the production of gold in the United States and the production of gold in all the world during the years from the beginning of Cleveland's Administration down to the present time, and you will find that the ratio by percentage of increase of the world's product of gold was greater for a number of the years of Cleveland's Administration than during the subsequent years of the Administration of McKinley. So that the whole of that argument falls absolutely to the ground. I will furnish in my speech the official statement of the Department, that will establish what I have said, although since that time I am free to admit that the increase of the gold production has been significant and important and is going on still.

Gold production.

Calendar year.	United States.	The world.
1890.....	\$32,845,000	\$118,848,700
1891.....	33,175,000	130,650,000
1892.....	33,000,000	146,651,500
1893.....	35,955,000	157,494,800
1894.....	39,500,000	181,567,800
1895.....	46,610,000	200,406,000
1896.....	53,088,000	202,251,600
1897.....	57,863,000	236,073,700
1898.....	64,463,000	286,879,700
1899.....	71,053,000	307,168,800
1900.....	79,171,000	255,634,500
1901.....	78,667,000	262,492,900
1902.....	80,600,000	296,737,600
1903.....	73,592,000	325,961,500
1904.....	80,465,000	346,892,200
1905 ^a	86,338,000	379,000,000

^a Estimated.

Annual average gold production of the world, 1800 to 1905.

1800 to 1850.....	\$16,000,000
1851 to 1890.....	120,000,000
1891 to 1900.....	210,000,000
1901 to 1905.....	320,000,000
1905 only (estimated).....	379,000,000

It will be seen that in the very next year following the unfortunate election of Cleveland the increase in the world's production of gold was \$11,000,000 and upward, and in the next year it reached more than \$35,000,000 increase, and in the years 1895 and 1896 the increase had amounted to \$54,000,000 in one year and \$56,000,000 in the next, and then in the hardest of all years the gold increase had reached the enormous sum of \$90,000,000. Here are facts that can not be disputed, taken from the official records of the country, which show beyond a reasonable doubt that the unusual, and it might be said unexpected, increase in the gold production of the world was powerless to even check the tide of Democratic ruin that swept over the country. The gold production in the United States in 1892 was \$33,000,000. That is the year of Cleveland's election. The gold production in 1897, when we were staggering under the effects of Cleveland's Administration, had reached the enormous sum of \$57,000,000, or an increase of \$22,000,000, and yet its effect upon the business of the country was absolutely imperceptible. The tide of woe swept on and on and other countries absorbed the gold.

There can be no more conclusive argument in support of this proposition than the fact that with the gold production of the world and the gold production of the United States increasing at a ratio unheard of theretofore Mr. Cleveland was compelled to borrow gold from Europe to pay the running expenses of his Administration. The tremendous influx of gold during the four years of his Administration fled, fled to pay the differences in the balance of trade between the United States and the world at large; fled paralyzed by the dying industries of the United States. The increase in the gold production from that day to this has not been at so great a ratio as was the increase during the Administration of Cleveland. So the whole fable is exposed.

Our answer to the whole of this is that the quantity of money does not necessarily affect the conditions of trade and prosperity in a country. It is not the question of how much money there is in the country, it is the question of the circulation of the money in the country. And therein lies the whole distinction in these two lines of argument. So, if any gentleman shall reply to anything that I may say, let him tell us what it was

that happened in 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895, and 1896 to prostrate the industries of the country to the terrible condition in which we found them in 1897, while gold production in the world increased from 1892 to 1897 in the great sum of \$106,000,000. What was it? The burden of the proof is not upon us. Does the mere presence of a Democratic President, a Democratic House, and a Democratic Senate, without any overt act of theirs, of itself constitute a sufficient cause to prostrate the business of the country? We do not claim it, but we do claim that it was the advertised purpose of the Democratic party, under the message of Cleveland and under the letter which he wrote so early, not only to press the repeal of the McKinley law, but to inaugurate a condition that would reverse the effect of the McKinley law itself.

But the time came when the people of the country changed their views upon this subject; and a Republican President, a Republican House, and not entirely a Republican Senate came as the result of the election of 1896. But a Senate came in which, under the Administration of William McKinley and under the potential persuasion of the condition of the country, yielding to the public demand, a few Democrats aided the Republicans of the Senate, and the Dingley bill was passed.

Now, we had reached the crisis in the discussion of the tariff question, and I invite your attention to the condition that existed. The Congress that was assembled in special session in March, 1897, found this country in a condition so terrible that it would be past belief if it had not been recorded at the time. In a compilation that was made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL], who has been very generous and kind in furnishing it to me, I find a statement made by a number of the governors of the Southern States, especially bewailing and bemoaning the conditions that existed at or about the time of the election of McKinley and the assembling of the Fifty-fifth Congress. I shall illustrate my speech somewhat with quotations on this subject. I do not care to read all of these numerous extracts that are compiled here.

Now, I started out by saying that the country ought not to be shocked at the prophetic utterances of men of the Democratic party. I believe there used to be a rule in the olden time somewhere that if a prophet made a mistake, if he prophesied distinctly that an event was going to happen, and it did not happen, they made some kind of a partition between his head and his body. If that had been done in this country, I fear there would have been a good many vacant seats in the House of Representatives, all on that side of the House. [Laughter.]

Now, before I proceed to these voluminous extracts, I ask your analysis of this proposition, as stated by the gentleman whose utterances I shall quote.

They did not tell us that they were afraid that existing conditions were going on; they did not tell us that our legislation in the Dingley bill was going to be of any benefit to the country, but they did tell us that the passage of the Dingley bill would affirmatively bring to the country a series of injurious results. It is not worth while now to say that you were prognosticating that the absence of gold, the absence of the volume of money, was going to bring trouble upon the country. You did not say that. One or two of our distinguished friends on the other side constantly cling to that idea, but the general cry was that the passage of the Dingley bill, a bill that had nothing to do with the currency, that had nothing to do with the gold or silver, but that the tariff feature of the Dingley bill, if passed, would bring affirmatively evils upon the country that they said did not exist at that time.

So you will have no room to answer me that the fact was that you wanted a larger volume of money and that a larger volume of money came; you can not put that forward as an answer, for that is not what you said, and you must stand by the record that you have made. You said expressly that if we would not pass the Dingley bill then good times would come. Then you said if we do pass the Dingley bill hard times would come, and come in these certain directions. You did not lack specifications in your bills that you filed in the court of public judgment. You said it will contract our commerce abroad; it will reduce the price of labor, and notably and conspicuously you said it will aim its heaviest blows at the farmer. These three propositions—lower wages, idle men, circumscribed foreign market and lower prices for the farmers' produce—you put forward as the evils.

Your most distinguished Democrat, and I speak of him as the most distinguished for his political misfortunes, stated in a speech that he made in New York in one of his hurried journeys there:

Wheat is only worth 65 cents a bushel, and it will never be any higher until the Democratic party is elected and these reforms are introduced.

He came to the miners in my Congressional district and said:

You are mining coal at 40 cents a ton; you do not like to do that, and you are working only two and a half or three days a week. You will never get more time or higher wages until you put the Democratic party in power.

Wheat has been ranging along in the neighborhood of a dollar a bushel, and the miners of my district have been mining coal at 80 cents a ton, working six days in the week, and seven if they want to, and that is a fair estimate of the whole of it.

Now, gentlemen, what have you to say? You say, "We will stick to our proposition that we were right then," and that is where you must stick. Now, I am going to refer to some of the great men of the Democratic party, and I want to begin with one of the most conspicuous States in this Union, and I do it now particularly because of the importance that that State has in the councils of the South and the prominence of the men of that State in the councils of the Nation. I refer to the State of Texas. We were approaching the passage of the Dingley bill. Everybody understood that it was going to pass. It had received the indorsement of the President, it was ready to pass in the House of Representatives, and its passage was reasonably assured in the Senate. And so the time had come for the Democratic party to come forward and state what they believed the effect of it was going to be on the country, and I repeat that your statements were not that it would break up present conditions, but you did state that of its own operation it would bring to the country these divers wrongs and injuries. It was to be something that was coming in the future, something that was to grow out of the passage of the Dingley bill. We had in this House of Representatives a very distinguished gentleman from Texas, a gentleman by the name of Lanham. He spoke exactly in the same line that others spoke, and here is what he said on the 19th of July, 1897. The bill had gone to the Senate, had passed on the 4th of July, or the night before, and gone to the committee of conference and had come back from the committee of conference and was pending upon a report of that committee in the House of Representatives:

Pass your bill, reeking as it does with blood and burdens, carrying as it does disaster and distress, freighted as it is with woe and waste, filled as it is with injustice and oppression to your fellow-men; but it will but briefly blot and blur the statute books of this mighty nation, for it is against the genius of our institutions, the ethics of civilization, the proprieties of life, the equities of good government, and the conscience of a free people that mammon shall be enthroned and that money shall rule in this land, consecrated to liberty and to justice.

A few days ago this same very distinguished gentleman, whom we all admire, wrote a message to the house and senate of Texas, and I shall try to show you best from his declaration how little safety there is in trusting to the opinion of a Democrat upon a party question. I find his message covering nearly two pages of the Galveston News of the issue of the 11th of January, the current month. It is very ably written, and I will simply quote a paragraph under the head of "Prosperity."

In closing the quadrennium of my service as governor it gives me pleasure and patriotic pride that so much of prosperity and contentment have prevailed. The material progress, industrial development, and general improvement that have marked these four years have never been excelled nor do I think equaled in any previous like period in the history of the State.

Now, let us see what he says has happened to it, and you will see that it answers and negatives everything that he prophesies:

Our taxable values have been greatly augmented. Lands have appreciated. Labor has been rewarded. Rural communities have thriven. Agriculture and horticulture have flourished and made general advancement in abundance and diversification of crops. Our farmers as a rule are comfortable and independent. Our live-stock industries have prospered. Manufactures have multiplied. Mining has been stimulated, resources hitherto latent—

That is, they never would have been discovered but for this change, and that is my own interpolation—

have been exploited and utilized. Towns have been built. Cities have grown larger. Capital has found profitable investment. Railroads have been constructed and extended. Commerce has expanded. Population has greatly increased. Six new counties have been organized. The State is exceedingly prosperous and progressing satisfactorily along all useful lines. The present is encouraging and the future is bright with promise.

Now, I think that the gentleman ought to apologize to the people of the country for having misled them to such an extent as that. But he was not alone. Texas had on the floor of this House a very distinguished Member, in fact, several of them. One of them has since been a governor of the State. He made a speech here in which he prophesied more evil even than did the average Democrat. I will only read a portion of what he said and print the balance of it:

Mr. Chairman, can prosperity proceed from grievous and burdensome taxation? If so, and the pending bill should in all its provisions be crystallized into law, this country will without delay realize an abundant and universal prosperity, and all classes and conditions in society will rejoice in the change that has taken place.

That was a correct prophecy, for the governor of that great

State has rejoiced with joy unspeakable and full of glory. He continues:

But, sir, prosperity can not, will not, come by such methods. Taxation can not make wealth, nor can the want of a sufficient currency enhance the value of property or of labor. This bill is the response which the Republican party has made to popular favor as expressed at the late election. Nothing else, we are told, will be done at the present session, except to pass some such measure as this and the four general appropriation laws. The Democratic and the Populist parties can stand such a policy as this. They will be benefited by it.

Well, they have been benefited by it, and the country has, too. The Populist party has been lost and forgotten, and the Democratic party has never been in power from that day to this. He goes on:

But can the people stand it? I think not, Mr. Chairman. It will but add to the general depression throughout the country, prevent the revival of trade, and retard an advance in prices. It will add to the abundance of the few and aggravate the necessities of the many.

Here are some of the effects of the Dingley tariff bill. First, I add the statement compiled from the report of the Secretary of Agriculture for the current year of the condition of the farmers of the country. These farmers were the special object of the said forebodings of our Democratic friends, and they surely were in distress at the time these pathetic utterances were made. Never was agriculture at so low an ebb, never had lands depreciated at such a ratio, and never was prosperity so absent as it was from the farmers of the United States.

THE FARMERS ARE PROSPEROUS.

That the farmers of the country are enjoying almost unexampled prosperity is made evident in the report of Secretary Wilson of the Department of Agriculture. Farm values computed in 1905 are greater than shown by the census of 1900 by nearly \$8,000,000,000, or about 50 per cent increase. Perhaps some deduction would be made for inflation of values in certain sections of the country; otherwise this is probably a fair estimate. The total wealth produced on the farms in 1906 is estimated at \$6,794,000,000, an increase of 8 per cent over 1905; this increase being in the face of a decline of \$40,000,000 in the farm value of the various cereal crops. The latter, however, being much larger in volume than the 1905 crops increases the total value by \$485,000,000. The following comparisons are available:

Farm values of the leading crops of 1906.

	1906.	1905.
Corn.....	\$1,100,000,000	\$1,116,697,000
Cotton.....	640,000,000	575,000,000
Hay.....	600,000,000	515,960,000
Wheat.....	450,000,000	518,072,000
Oats.....	300,000,000	277,048,000
Potatoes.....	150,000,000	160,821,000
Barley.....	65,000,000	55,047,000
Tobacco.....	55,000,000	48,674,000
Sugar, sirup, and molasses.....	75,000,000	50,000,000
Flaxseed.....	25,000,000	24,049,000
Rice.....	18,000,000	12,286,000
Rye.....	18,000,000	16,755,000
Hops.....	7,000,000	6,000,000
Unenumerated.....	3,291,000,000	3,507,591,000
Total.....	6,794,000,000	6,309,000,000

Estimates of quantities.

	1906.	1905.
Corn.....bushels..	2,881,000	2,707,993,000
Hay.....tons.....	50,500,000	60,500,000
Wheat.....bushels..	740,000,000	692,979,000
Potatoes.....do....	300,000,000	260,741,000
Barley.....do.....	145,000,000	136,651,000
Tobacco.....pounds..	629,000,000	633,034,000
Flaxseed.....bushels..	27,000,000	28,478,000
Rye.....do.....	23,000,000	27,616,000

The farm still overshadows the mill and factory in providing exports, in which cotton maintains a long lead, amounting to \$207,000,000 of the total of \$976,000,000 of agricultural exports. The Secretary says: "It is upon the selling of a surplus in foreign countries that the farmer depends for the maintenance of profitable prices for meat animals;" but he also says that every increase of one-fourth of a cent per pound in the average price of meat raises the total yearly expense to consumers by \$41,883,000. Thus it is inevitable that a larger export trade in foodstuffs, by maintaining or increasing the home price, though it may be good for the farmer, is bad for the consumer; and this accounts in part for the higher cost of living.

In conclusion, the Secretary says:

"Cotton planters are now out of their former bondage to future maintenance, and in the Middle West there has been a conversion of a million agricultural debtors paying high rates of interest into financially independent farmers, debt free and offering their savings to the banks at as small a rate of interest as 2 per cent. Farmers are using their new capital to abolish the waste places of the land and along many lines of improved production. Formerly there was an abundance of farm labor and a scarcity of farm capital. Now these conditions are reversed—labor is scarce and capital abundant."

INCREASE OF SAVINGS.

It is often remarked that in these prosperous times most people are living somewhat beyond their means and apparently are making no pro-

vision for the future. But recent statistics relating to savings banks deposits show that many thousands of salaried people and wage-earners are not expending all of their money for luxuries or even for the necessities of life. During the last ten years the number of depositors in savings banks increased from 5,065,494 to 8,027,192, or about 60 per cent, while the amount of deposits rose from \$1,907,156,277 to \$3,482,137,198, or about 80 per cent. On the usual basis of five persons to each family, this means that about half the families in the United States have bank accounts averaging \$433.78. Moreover, this makes no allowance for more than \$600,000,000 deposited in building and loan associations by 1,600,000 individuals nor for the increase in resources of national and other banks less representative of the plain people.

Mr. BAILEY, a somewhat conspicuous member of the delegation from Texas in that day and occupying a most conspicuous place to-day in the Democratic party, also expressed his views. This is an extract that has been often reproduced. It came with force and eloquence from the Democratic side, an utterance by its leader, the leader of the minority in that House. It came as a warning to the people of the country. It was on the 19th day of March, 1897, and Mr. BAILEY said:

I warn you that if this bill fails, as fail it will, to bring the prosperity which the Republicans have promised, you will not live long enough to obtain a patient audience with the American people upon the absurd proposition that you can make them prosperous by increasing their taxes. You have promised to make the times better for all the people; and you must redeem that promise or be driven from the high places which you occupy. Four years of the taxation proposed in this bill will prove a severe drain upon the energies of our people and the resources of this country; but if they demonstrate, as I believe they will, the vicious errors of the protection system, the lesson, though costly, will be worth its price. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I am free to say to the gentleman from Maine—

And I ask you to hear this—

if your revision of the tariff and your increase of taxation can bring prosperity to the country, then you are wise and patriotic; having done that, to do no more, because if that is all that is necessary it is all which ought to be done. The country gave you the power to pass laws and you have attempted to restore prosperity by increasing taxes. If you succeed the Democratic party might as well not make a nomination in the next Presidential election.

There was a prophecy thoroughly fulfilled. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. He was wiser than he knew.

Mr. GROSVENOR. He spoke more wisely than he knew. He confesses that if we made prosperity or if prosperity came, which was the language, it was useless for the Democratic party to make a nomination. Prosperity did come, and yet, defiant of your leaders, you made a nomination and were whipped, and then foolishly, in my judgment, made another, and now you will get the third or fourth repetition of the same terrible vengeance of the people of the country.

If you succeed the Democratic party might as well not make a nomination. If you fail you might as well not make a nomination in the next Presidential election. Now let us give the country a chance to decide who is right and who is wrong. You have applied your remedy. I am confident it will fail. I am so confident of its failure that I want to raise no other issue. I want the country to decide between your wisdom and ours upon the measures which you have already proposed. Let the country say whether it is tariff revision or financial reform which shall work out our redemption.

Mr. BAILEY again—and I will quote what he said—elaborates the same ideas in a further speech which he made on the 3d day of May, when the bill was still pending in the House:

When the people voted the Republican party into power they intended that party to apply its principles. I believe they made a mistake, but I have confidence enough in their intelligence they will discover that mistake and rectify it. Let the Republican party meet its responsibility, and let us provide it with no explanations for its failure. That is the supreme issue—prosperity. If you bring it, the country will credit you for your good service. If you fail to bring it, the country will dismiss you from its service. If you demonstrate, as demonstrate you will, that a high-tariff under a gold standard will not bring prosperity, I will stake my political fortune on the proposition that the American people will then vote to restore bimetalism as the only means of restoring prosperity to this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, I do not want to pile up all the honors upon Texas. I have one or two other extracts which, with the leave of the House, I will publish; but I want to come to another distinguished gentleman who has done me the honor to come within hearing distance of my few remarks and to show you not only the Democratic leader of the House at that day but the very able and distinguished leader of the minority of the House at this day was as much at fault as was his distinguished leader. Here is what Mr. WILLIAMS said. He always says it with such an assurance of its truth and its accuracy that I have to go out and walk up and down in the lobby sometimes to shake off the effect of his utterance and get back to reason and common sense. [Laughter and applause.] December, 1889, the gentleman had discovered exactly what had followed in this country, and he shifted the position of the Democratic party in a very adroit sentence or two. This is what he said on December 15, page 466 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that Congress:

Mr. Chairman, answering for myself, I stand here to say that I have never yet made a public utterance by which I would not abide, because

the utterance has always been not only the conviction of my constituents, but my own. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I thought he said "conscience," but he said "constituents."

And had I the power now, standing here as I do, if I were the czar of America and had unlimited power, I would to-morrow open the mints to the free coinage of silver at the rate of 16 to 1 with but one doubt in my mind, and that doubt would be whether it were not better to go to the world's ratio of 15½ to 1.

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman still thinks silver ought to be coined at the mint at the ratio of 16 to 1?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I do.

It does not appear the gentleman from Mississippi answered that question.

But there is another great State in the Union, and its representation upon this floor is always able and conspicuous. I want to show you how all phases of Democracy on that side of the House concurred in these prophetic declarations. There was then on the floor of this House a gentleman by the name of CHAMP CLARK, of Missouri, who has been here ever since, and I hope he may stay here until he becomes the last vestige of the Democracy in this country [laughter on the Republican side], for he is an outspoken, brave, and generally wrong-headed statesman. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] This was uttered on the 20th day of March, 1897. That was when the Dingley bill was pending. It had gotten under way pretty rapidly. It had been made, as you all know, practically during the winter months of December, January, and February, and finished in March.

It was not made in a committee room of this Capitol. It was made in a couple of committee rooms in a hotel uptown. It was not made with the presence of the members of the Democratic Ways and Means Committee, but it was made as a Republican measure by the remaining members of the Republican part of the Ways and Means Committee. I will read:

The Republican party have always been very long on promises and very short on performances. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] You told them [the people] that as soon as McKinley was elected a tide of prosperity was going to roll over the land that would come up to the very chins of the people. [Laughter.] Where is that tide of prosperity now? It seems to have gotten stunted somehow, belated somewhere. It is merely a case of "arrested development." [Laughter and applause.] Prosperity is coming, is it? You are bringing it now, are you? Let me tell you about it.

And then see how the poet breaks forth:

Republican prosperity is—

Like poppies spread,
You seize the flower, its bloom is shed;
Or, like the snowfall in the river,
A moment white, then melts forever;
Or, like the borealis race,
That flits ere you can point the place;
Or, like the rainbow's lovely form,
Evanishing amid the storm.

But my friend CLARK had something else to say, passing over the declaration of Mr. COCKRAN on the 31st day of March, the day that the McKinley bill was reported to the House from the Committee on Ways and Means. He said:

I repeat, so that all men may hear—

I do not like to read this, and if I had not entered upon it I would not have done so. The gentleman has a right to have me say in advance that he will repudiate this declaration under all circumstances, and was probably driven to it by the annoyance of some wicked Republican—

I repeat, so that all men may hear, that I am a free trader, and take my stand with Sir Robert Peel, Richard Cobden, John Bright, and Henry George. I may be an humble member of that illustrious company, but it is better to be a doorkeeper in the house of honest free traders than to dwell in the tents of wicked protectionists.

Then on the same day:

A beastly majority in 1896, secured by means forbidden in morals and dangerous to our institutions, hath made you Republicans mad.

But you will be brought to your senses when the people again get a shot at you in the year of our Lord and Master 1896.

They have had several shots since, and we are doing pretty well, thank you. How do you find yourself? [Laughter.]

Then you will be in the condition of the man out of whom the devil was cast, and after his soul was swept and garnished, the devil returned, bringing with him seven other devils. The Bible says that the last state of that man was worse than the first.

By the eye of faith I can see a million bicyclers, with pneumatic tires, riding down protection and liars [laughter and applause].

Broke out again with his poetic tendency—

because you are putting up the price of bicycles 35 per cent.

The women of the land—God bless 'em—will make their husbands, sons, brothers, and sweethearts vote against you, because under the Dingley bill they can only have one dress where they had two under the Wilson-Gorman bill. [Laughter.]

Seven million farmers will dig you up with their hoes—

Listen to this. This is one of the finest things in the English language—

plow you up with their plows, beat you with their mauls, hackle you with their harrows, hammer you with their sledges, rake you with their curryscombs, pulverize you with their disks, cut you down with their

axes, split you to pieces with the froes, ride you on their barbed-wire fences, toss you on their pitchforks—

I did not think the Senator—but I must not do that [laughter].—

smite you with their pile drivers, grind you through their sausage mills [laughter], mow you down with their reapers, bind you up in great bundles, run you through their thrashing machines, and scatter you as worthless chaff, because you are raising the price of all farming implements by 45 per cent. [Laughter and applause.]

I must stop here and give you an illustration under that subject, and it applies to the whole of this outcry about farmers. Not many years ago a farmer in the State of Nebraska went to the town where he was in the habit of trading and sought to buy a buggy, and having selected a very cheap one he asked the dealer the price of it. The dealer said it was \$62. The man said:

Well, this buggy I want to buy is the same sort of buggy exactly that you sold me some years ago for \$55.

The dealer said:

I will go and consult the books and see what that trade was.

He went and examined his books, and he came back and said:

Yes, I sold you that for \$55; but you didn't have any money, and you brought me in 500 bushels of corn and paid for the buggy at 11 cents a bushel. Now, I will sell you this buggy for \$62; and if you will go and bring me 500 bushels of corn I will give you this buggy and a self-binder at \$125, a sulky plow at \$35, a small plow for \$12, and I will give you \$16 in cash.

[Laughter.]

That is a fair illustration, and I give it as a fair illustration of the situation throughout the country.

But Mr. CLARK went on:

Every patient forced to endure a surgical operation will loathe you because you have increased the tax on anesthetics. Every lover of learning will detest you because you have laid a prohibitive tariff on books, thereby shutting the gates of knowledge so far as was in your power. Every child that dies of diphtheria will pass away pronouncing on you its lasting curse because you have put up the price of anti-toxin. You are arraying against you every right-thinking man and woman in the land.

There must be a large majority of wrong-thinking men and women in this country. [Laughter.]

Since he, miscalled the Morning Star,
Nor man nor fiend hath fallen so far—

as you will fall when the people of the United States find out the numerous monstrosities contained in this bill.
[Applause on the Democratic side.]

That was the Dingley bill.

Then said Mr. CLARK nine days afterwards. When I heard him make that utterance I said to myself he has straightened up and has come back to his sober senses. I do not use the word "sober" in any other relation than a proper one:

Mr. CLARK. [March 31, 1897.] Mr. Chairman, after nine days of sore travail, at least one truth has been brought forth on the Republican side of this House, and that by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Linney], when he said that I would destroy every custom-house in America.

I am not going to read that. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You can go on and read it all you want to.

Mr. GROSVENOR (continuing):

Mr. CLARK. [May 6, 1897.] McKinley prosperity is a myth. It is always over the divide—in the next county—on the other side of the hill. If we live till McKinley prosperity comes, we will all double discount Methuselah in length of days.

[Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Then comes Mr. DE ARMOND and Mr. Dockery. Mr. DE ARMOND is present, and I may venture to quote what he said about the effect of the Dingley bill.

He said:

Mr. DE ARMOND. [July 24, 1897.] We will meet you at every crossroads; we will defy you upon every stump; we will strip bare your skeletons; we will show that your tariff bill just passed, about which you boast so much—the bill that is to herald in prosperity for the few and adversity for the many—is the most iniquitous, the most villainous, the most oppressive tariff bill ever made.

Mr. DE ARMOND [March 25, 1897]. What is there in your legislation for the toilers of the land? What is there in your bill to give work and wages to the idle or to add to the price of the products of the farm or plantation? What is there to lessen the outlay which must be made, or to increase the income which must be secured, in order to meet the requirements of civilized existence? What is there to raise the price of corn and wheat and cattle and cotton? * * * You may give some prosperity—I do not know whether you will or not—you may give some prosperity to favored spots in New England, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, to that favored region which lies east of the Alleghenies and north of the Potomac. You may do it; I do not know. But you will only do that temporarily, if at all. Yours will be but a fitful gleam of prosperity until something is done which will bring relief to the West and to the South; until something is done which will bring prosperity to the country in general without wrong to any class, without hardship upon any, without partiality toward any. Your measure will not do that. * * * And when the appeal is made to the American people; when those who are deluded see how hollow, how empty is this claim that through tariff legislation such as you propose prosperity can be brought to them; when want presses down closer and harder upon them; when the scarcity of money be-

comes daily and hourly more apparent and the suffering from it more intense—then will come up from that mighty unpurchased and unpurchasable host such an answer as will echo around the world and be embodied in the statutes of our country. * * * When prosperity returns to the country, as I hope it soon may, when there are changed political conditions prevailing in this land—and I do not look for the return of prosperity earlier—when prosperity comes, it will not start from the already inordinately protected manufacturer of the East. * * * I look to the West and South for the signs of returning prosperity, that real prosperity which will not come until, through the righteous indignation of an outraged and long-suffering people, you who scorn economy, who revel in high taxation, riot in extravagance, and fatten in the money famine, shall be driven from power, and the friends of the people shall take your places. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Then Mr. CLARK came into the discussion of that day with one choice contribution.

Mr. CLARK [March 30, 1897]. We may be "fools" and "leather-heads" and all that sort of thing, but I tell you, gentlemen, the people living west of the Allegheny Mountains and south of the Potomac have sense enough to know when they are sandbagged and held up.

These declarations of the two distinguished gentlemen from Missouri exhibit to the reader the effect that this Republican legislation has had upon the farmers of the country.

Here follows an exhibit of the prices of corn, wheat, oats, hay, and hogs during the years 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896, and 1907:

Prices of specified commodities.

Year.	Corn, per bushel.		Wheat, per bushel.	
	Farm price, Dec. 1, preceding year, United States.	Closing, Chicago, Jan. 2, for January delivery.	Farm price, Dec. 1, preceding year, United States.	Closing, Chicago, Jan. 2, for January delivery.
	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
1892	40.6	39½	83.9	88½
1893	39.4	40½	62.4	72½
1894	36.5	34½	53.8	59½
1895	45.7	44½	49.1	53½
1896	25.3	25½	50.9	56
1907	39.9	39½	65.9	76½

Year.	Oats, per bushel.		Hay, per ton.	
	Farm price, Dec. 1, preceding year, United States.	Closing, Chicago, Jan. 2, for January delivery.	Farm price, Dec. 1, preceding year, United States.	No. 2 timothy, Chicago, Jan. 2, cash.
	Cents.	Cents.	Dollars.	Dollars.
1892	31.5	30½	8.12	12.25
1893	31.7	30½	8.20	9.50
1894	29.4	28½	8.68	9.25
1895	32.4	28½	8.54	9.50
1896	19.9	16½	8.35	10.75
1907	31.7	34	10.37	14.75

Year.	Medium to good steers, Chicago, Jan. 2, cash per 100 pounds.		Mixed hogs, Chicago, Jan. 2, cash per 100 pounds.	
	Dollars.		Dollars.	
1892	3.75-4.40		3.90-4.05	
1893	3.90-4.60		6.60-7.00	
1894	3.60-4.30		5.10-5.45	
1895	3.70-4.35		4.05-4.60	
1896	3.40-4.00		3.45-3.67½	
1897	5.20-6.65		6.15-6.42½	

Following this I publish a table of the domestic exports of these articles: Corn, wheat, flour, oats, hay, live cattle, and live hogs:

Domestic exports in the fiscal years ending June 30, 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896, 1905, and 1906.

Year ending June 30—	Corn.			
	Shelled, unground.		Meal.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Bushels.	Dollars.	Barrels.	Dollars.
1892	75,451,849	41,590,460	287,609	919,961
1893	46,087,274	24,587,511	271,155	793,081
1894	65,324,841	30,211,154	291,172	770,526
1895	27,091,137	14,650,767	223,567	648,844
1896	99,992,835	37,836,862	276,885	654,121
1905	88,807,223	47,446,921	371,565	1,113,285
1906	117,718,657	62,061,856	543,794	1,623,397

Domestic exports in the fiscal years ending June 30, 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896, 1905, and 1906—Continued.

Year ending June 30—	Wheat.			
	Unground.		Flour.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>	<i>Barrels.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>
1892.....	157,280,351	161,399,132	15,195,769	75,362,283
1893.....	117,121,109	93,531,970	16,620,339	75,494,347
1894.....	88,415,230	59,407,041	16,859,533	69,271,770
1895.....	76,102,704	43,805,663	15,268,892	51,651,928
1896.....	60,650,080	39,709,868	14,620,864	52,025,217
1905.....	4,394,402	3,905,579	8,826,335	40,176,136
1906.....	34,973,291	23,757,517	13,919,018	59,106,869

Year ending June 30—	Oats.			
	Unmilled.		Oatmeal.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>	<i>Pounds.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>
1892.....	9,425,078	3,842,559	20,908,190	555,957
1893.....	2,380,643	951,920	5,762,701	160,660
1894.....	5,750,266	2,027,934	9,719,337	238,528
1895.....	569,977	200,793	20,499,253	566,321
1896.....	13,012,590	3,497,611	38,592,504	939,502
1905.....	5,479,308	2,085,992	52,476,917	1,423,742
1906.....	46,324,935	16,234,918	37,972,900	948,088

Year ending June 30—	Hay.		Live cattle.		Live hogs.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
		<i>Tons.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>	<i>Number.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>	<i>Number.</i>
1892.....	35,201	582,838	394,607	35,099,095	31,963	364,081
1893.....	33,084	519,640	287,094	26,032,428	27,375	397,162
1894.....	54,446	890,654	359,278	33,461,922	1,553	14,753
1895.....	47,117	699,029	331,722	30,608,796	7,130	72,424
1896.....	59,052	874,048	372,461	34,560,672	21,049	227,297
1905.....	66,557	1,089,505	567,806	40,598,048	44,496	416,692
1906.....	70,172	1,116,307	584,239	42,081,170	50,170	630,998

In a more condensed form I publish an exhibit furnished me by Mr. O. P. Austin, the indefatigable Chief of the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Commerce and Labor:

Domestic exports of the following articles from the United States during the years indicated.

Year ending June 30—	Corn.		Wheat.		Oats.	
	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>
1892.....	75,451,849	41,590,460	157,230,351	161,399,132	9,425,078	3,842,559
1893.....	46,037,274	24,587,511	117,121,109	93,531,970	2,380,643	951,920
1894.....	65,324,841	30,211,154	88,415,230	59,407,041	5,750,266	2,027,934
1895.....	27,691,137	14,650,767	76,102,704	43,805,663	569,977	200,793
1896.....	99,992,835	37,836,862	60,650,080	39,709,868	13,012,590	3,497,611
1905.....	88,807,223	47,446,921	4,394,402	3,905,579	5,479,308	2,085,992
1906.....	117,718,657	62,061,856	34,973,291	23,757,517	46,324,935	16,234,918

Year ending June 30—	Cattle.		Hogs.		Hay.	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>	<i>Tons.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>
1892.....	394,607	35,099,095	31,963	364,081	35,201	582,838
1893.....	287,094	26,032,428	29,375	397,162	33,084	519,640
1894.....	359,278	33,461,922	1,553	14,753	54,446	890,654
1895.....	331,722	30,608,796	7,130	72,424	47,117	699,029
1896.....	372,461	34,560,672	21,049	227,297	59,052	874,048
1905.....	567,806	40,598,048	44,496	416,692	66,557	1,089,505
1906.....	584,239	42,081,170	50,170	630,998	70,172	1,116,307

O. P. AUSTIN, Chief of Bureau.
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
BUREAU OF STATISTICS,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1907.

By all this it is easy to see what wondrous effect the Dingley bill had upon the country.

To show the steady growth of the business of the country I publish another table showing the imports and exports of merchandise by months for the years 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, and 1906, followed by a summary of each twelve-month period ending June 30 from 1895 to 1905, showing the tremendous growth of our imports and exports of merchandise, not alone the products of the country.

Imports and exports of merchandise, by months.

Months.	Imports.				Exports.			Excess of—	
	Free of duty.	Dutiable.	Total.	Per cent of free.	Domestic.	Foreign.	Total.	Imports.	Exports.
1902:									
August.....	\$28,673,894	\$50,249,387	\$78,923,281	36.3	\$92,977,572	\$1,964,738	\$94,942,310		\$16,019,029
September.....	36,490,456	51,245,890	87,736,346	41.6	119,350,299	1,886,085	121,236,384		33,500,038
October.....	33,156,189	54,267,881	87,424,070	37.9	141,463,249	2,864,179	144,327,428		66,903,358
November.....	34,539,696	50,846,474	85,386,170	40.4	123,182,878	2,012,740	125,200,618		39,814,448
December.....	40,664,420	53,692,567	94,356,987	43.1	145,909,568	2,082,845	147,992,403		53,635,416
1903:									
January.....	36,655,322	48,519,464	85,174,786	43.0	131,590,143	2,402,126	133,992,269		48,817,483
February.....	36,964,754	45,657,492	82,622,246	44.7	122,609,193	2,976,831	125,586,024		42,963,778
March.....	43,083,391	53,147,066	96,230,457	44.8	129,295,003	2,798,961	132,093,964		35,868,507
April.....	38,726,766	48,955,340	87,682,106	44.2	107,692,056	2,135,159	109,827,215		22,145,109
May.....	33,215,422	48,819,715	79,035,137	42.0	98,481,760	2,447,831	100,929,591		21,894,454
June.....	33,812,481	48,187,296	81,999,777	41.2	92,830,595	2,392,251	95,222,846		13,223,069
Total, 12 months.....	426,180,979	599,538,258	1,025,719,237	41.5	1,392,231,302	27,910,377	1,420,141,679		394,422,442
1904:									
July.....	36,277,063	45,910,760	82,187,823	44.1	89,604,237	2,209,028	91,813,265		9,625,442
August.....	35,130,329	46,918,933	82,049,262	42.8	87,556,344	1,890,113	89,446,457		7,397,195
September.....	36,887,933	44,928,709	81,816,642	45.1	108,190,383	2,174,457	110,364,840		28,548,198
October.....	35,661,481	46,259,666	81,921,147	43.3	158,308,993	2,079,325	160,388,318		78,467,361
November.....	33,945,708	43,060,602	77,006,310	44.1	158,396,088	1,872,450	160,268,538		83,262,228
December.....	37,069,588	40,699,046	77,768,634	47.7	173,092,388	1,727,178	174,819,566		97,050,932
1905:									
January.....	39,449,377	43,140,489	82,589,866	47.7	140,038,436	2,006,734	142,045,170		59,455,304
February.....	46,094,994	48,927,506	95,022,500	51.8	116,969,249	1,841,033	118,810,282		29,777,782
March.....	43,278,895	48,069,514	91,348,409	47.4	117,190,812	2,697,637	119,888,449		28,540,540
April.....	37,154,766	46,367,116	83,521,882	44.5	107,473,147	2,407,258	109,880,405		25,358,523
May.....	37,704,424	42,993,737	80,698,161	46.7	87,470,455	2,416,470	89,886,925		9,188,764
June.....	35,476,182	45,681,053	81,157,235	43.7	90,898,485	2,326,381	93,224,866		12,067,631
Total, 12 months.....	454,130,240	536,957,131	991,087,371	45.8	1,435,179,017	25,648,254	1,460,827,271		469,739,900
1906:									
July.....	31,580,899	39,613,044	71,193,943	44.3	82,977,484	2,245,995	85,223,479		14,029,536
August.....	41,169,898	46,567,970	87,737,868	47.0	90,100,683	2,153,198	92,253,881		4,516,013
September.....	37,914,172	46,210,803	84,124,975	45.1	132,806,054	1,959,370	134,765,424		50,140,449
October.....	45,756,388	47,021,532	92,777,920	49.1	160,477,256	2,050,687	162,527,943		69,750,023
November.....	46,510,971	48,659,201	95,170,172	48.9	156,378,362	1,690,295	158,068,657		62,898,485
December.....	48,526,237	48,040,522	96,566,759	50.2	143,440,810	1,812,449	145,253,259		48,686,500
1907:									
January.....	46,322,059	52,020,817	98,342,876	47.1	121,612,550	1,984,833	123,597,383		25,254,507
February.....	48,305,414	54,778,999	103,084,413	46.9	105,025,472	1,847,310	106,872,782		3,786,369
March.....	47,857,024	62,574,164	110,431,188	43.3	133,970,477	3,007,882	136,978,359		26,547,241
April.....	44,686,684	50,423,604	95,110,288	47.0	125,369,998	3,214,876	128,584,874		33,465,086
May.....	40,576,457	51,948,967	92,525,424	43.9	121,814,016	2,479,553	124,293,569		31,288,145
June.....	38,236,099	52,211,146	90,447,245	42.3	118,782,409	2,371,077	121,153,486		30,706,241
Total, 12 months.....	517,442,302	600,070,769	1,117,513,071	46.3	1,491,744,641	26,817,025	1,518,561,666		401,048,595
1908:									
July.....	35,936,889	48,575,717	84,512,606	42.5	105,404,155	2,526,266	107,930,421		23,417,815
August.....	39,782,642	56,048,516	95,831,158	41.5	115,913,945	1,754,170	117,668,115		21,886,957
September.....	44,789,288	57,248,047	102,037,335	43.9	134,210,474	1,773,342	135,983,816		33,996,486
October.....	49,665,046	57,779,863	107,444,909	46.2	152,047,411	2,325,568	154,372,979		46,928,070
November.....	46,647,695	51,636,619	98,284,314	47.5	168,888,125	1,944,796	170,832,921		72,043,607
December.....	47,708,843	53,433,956	101,142,799	47.2	197,399,520	2,339,000	199,738,520		98,695,721

Imports and exports of merchandise, by months—Continued.

Months.	Imports.				Exports.			Excess of—	
	Free of duty.	Dutiable.	Total.	Per cent of free.	Domestic.	Foreign.	Total.	Imports.	Exports.
1906:									
January	\$49,765,135	\$56,756,390	\$106,521,525	46.7	\$168,395,823	\$2,207,230	\$170,603,053		\$61,081,528
February	46,385,124	57,814,073	104,199,197	44.5	139,771,723	2,008,251	141,779,974		37,575,777
Total, 8 months	360,630,657	439,293,181	799,923,838	45.1	1,181,526,176	16,873,623	1,198,399,799		398,475,961
Twelve months ending June 30—									
1895	363,233,795	368,736,170	731,969,965	49.6	793,392,599	14,145,566	807,538,165		75,568,200
1896	369,757,470	409,967,204	779,724,674	47.4	863,200,487	19,406,451	882,606,938		102,882,264
1897	381,938,243	382,792,169	764,730,412	49.9	1,032,007,603	18,985,953	1,050,993,556		286,263,144
1898	297,414,175	324,635,479	616,049,654	47.3	1,210,291,913	21,190,417	1,231,482,330		615,432,676
1899	300,279,810	396,868,679	697,148,489	43.4	1,203,931,222	23,092,081	1,227,023,302		529,874,813
1900	367,296,866	482,704,318	849,941,184	43.2	1,370,763,571	23,719,510	1,394,483,082		544,541,898
1901	339,608,669	483,563,496	823,172,165	41.3	1,460,462,806	27,302,111	1,487,764,917		664,592,826
1902	396,818,871	506,502,077	903,320,948	43.9	1,355,481,861	26,237,575	1,381,719,401		478,398,453
1903	426,180,979	599,538,258	1,025,719,237	41.5	1,392,231,302	27,910,401	1,420,141,679		394,422,442
1904	454,130,240	536,957,131	991,087,371	45.8	1,435,179,017	25,648,377	1,460,827,271		469,739,900
1905	517,442,302	600,070,769	1,117,513,071	46.3	1,491,744,641	26,817,254	1,518,561,666		401,048,595

Well, Mr. Chairman, I might go on for a long period of time citing utterances of Democratic statesmen, Mr. Little, of Arkansas, Mr. Robinson, of Indiana. I am sure they will be glad to see these choice extracts reproduced. There are quite a good many of them, all in the same line. Mr. BRUNDIDGE, of Arkansas, said on the 24th of March:

They—

His constituents—

have already in the past few years witnessed the depreciation in value of their homes, their farms, and every vestige of property that they own.

That was under the Wilson bill. He was right about that, they had.

The products of their farms and shops, etc.

Death sentence of the Republican party.

We filed a petition in error, getting a reversal of the judgment, and here we are. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

And in four short years, I believe in two, they will rise up and by an uncorrupted and uncoerced ballot they will say to you, in the language of that greatest of all books, "You have been weighed in the balance and found wanting. This year thou shalt die." [Laughter.]

A MEMBER. Who was that?

Mr. GROSVENOR. That was the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BRUNDIDGE]. Now, I should not like to discriminate against any gentleman [laughter], and yet I will not weary the House much longer with a continuation of these extracts. Inasmuch as the great Democratic Representative on the Committee on Appropriations, my time-honored and much-esteemed friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON], still holds out to burn [laughter], I will read what he says. He is a calm, deliberate man, always careful to go no step beyond the point where his convictions drive him. This was on the 24th of March. It puts me in mind of an old-time Methodist love feast. The handwriting was on the wall. The bill was to pass, and they all got up and said, in language of the old time, "I rise to say;" and then the few utterances were delivered. Now, the gentlemen from Georgia, and I include Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. Tate, and Mr. ADAMSON, on that occasion said:

Mr. TATE. [March 24, 1897.] When the sturdy farmers of this country, who are to-day plowing their fields, * * * fully understand the provisions of this bill, they will justly repudiate those who seek, at the dictation of the protected classes, to fasten this unjust legislation upon the country. [Applause.] Sir, the people of this country will not have prosperity until we restore the money of our fathers.

Mr. ADAMSON. [March 23, 1897.] A country which can withstand the ravages of the Republican party for thirty years may reasonably hope to survive all possible calamities, political or elemental, wars, pestilence, or famine, and live to rejoice in prosperity, power, and freedom when the sectional party of corporations, trusts, and corruption shall have fallen to rise no more. [Applause.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. [March 24, 1897.] Some one stated on the floor yesterday that if the South and West wanted their industries encouraged we must vote the Republican ticket, and thus, I suppose, the word "industries" means Republican industries. The departure, however, is a bold and open declaration that this tariff bill has a double purpose—raising revenues and encouraging industries—but, unfortunately, for agricultural industries South and North this bill brings no relief, but, instead, increases burdens. * * * Trusting to a conservative, sensible, honest, and interested people, who will have a chance at those who are responsible for this measure in 1898, and believing firmly that the verdict rendered then will be "Not well done, unfaithful servants; retire and give place to those who will ever care for and legislate for the whole people, without regard to party or section."

Mr. BARTLETT. [March 29, 1897.] When we shall return to the doctrines of the founders of this Government; when we shall economically administer the Government; when the lawmaking power shall remember that the agricultural interest of our country is essentially connected with every other and is superior in importance to them all; that as the business of manufacture and commerce tend to increase the value of

agricultural products and to extend their application to the wants and comforts of society they deserve the fostering care of the Government; when all classes and all sections of this country shall be alike regarded; when laws are passed that affect all alike, that lay the burdens of government equally, and grant special privileges to none; when the farmer and the producer shall have a sufficient and just return for their products and their labor, then we may expect a return of prosperity, and not before.

Following this, for the benefit of the gentlemen who are worried about the laborers, I append the average rate per hour of common laborers in the United States in fifteen specified industries in 1905, compared with wages in the same industries from 1892 to 1896. These figures are from the official records of the country.

Average rate of wages per hour of common laborers in the United States in fifteen specified industries in 1905, compared with wages in 1892-1896.

[From Bulletin No. 65 of the United States Bureau of Labor. These figures are not exhaustive, but are based on a large number of representative establishments.]

Industries.	Average rate of wages per hour in 1905.	Per cent of increase in rate of wages in 1905 over year specified.				
		1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
Brick	\$0.1637	12.4	14.0	15.6	18.3	16.3
Building trades	.1867	10.5	12.4	18.3	16.5	18.5
Cars, steam railroads	.1542	7.1	4.0	7.9	10.9	9.9
Flour	.1686	20.2	19.7	1.97	18.2	13.6
Foundry and machine shop	.1617	11.9	12.5	16.5	16.4	14.9
Gas	.1749	8.7	2.5	1.5	4.3	41.0
Glass	.1533	18.0	18.0	19.4	22.5	22.1
Lumber	.1606	12.9	13.4	18.9	22.0	20.6
Marble and stone work	.2014	11.4	8.6	11.7	12.5	12.1
Paper and wood pulp	.1534	21.0	22.6	22.2	20.1	20.5
Planing mill	.1490	11.0	14.6	19.8	17.5	16.8
Shipbuilding	.1554	15.7	10.4	8.5	6.1	10.9
Slaughtering and meat packing	.1687	3.4	9.9	9.7	10.3	10.8
Streets and sewers, contract work	.1852	31.0	34.1	32.6	30.6	25.0
Streets and sewers, municipal work	.2130	15.0	15.2	12.0	13.3	15.2
Average		13.8	12.9	15.4	16.0	15.1

° Decrease.

Showing that the very spots in the line which they assaulted are the ones where the very strength of that legislation has come.

But Virginia wheeled into line, and on the 23d of March Mr. Swanson, now governor of that Commonwealth, said:

Each of these recurring years—

That is, the past four years—

has brought times harder than the preceding; each brought greater business depression, greater fall in prices, greater poverty. Increasing debt and distress have come along with increased industry and frugality. People's woes have grown despite the largest agricultural crops ever produced. In less than four years, in time of profound peace, with bountiful crops and harvests, two extraordinary sessions of Congress have been called to furnish measures of relief to a suffering people. The Wilson bill has been a detriment and not a benefit. The curse of the country has been the gold standard and not reduced tariff taxes. The passage of this bill means to destroy this vast foreign trade which is fast increasing each year.

Foreign trade to-day is double what it was at that time.

It means on our part a policy of isolation instead of one of progress and enterprise. The decreased importation of foreign goods under the Wilson bill also shows that the manufacturer under a low revenue tariff is better able to control the home markets. The manufacturer is suffering, as everybody else is suffering, not from lower tariff taxes, for this has been beneficial, but on account of falling prices resulting from the appreciation of money, which the existence of the gold standard has produced. There can be no return of prosperity to the furnaces and mills, as there can be none to the farmers, until there is a restoration of prices. The demand for gold can only be lessened by creating a demand for silver equal with gold, which will occur when

we give silver equal rights in money. When this is done then the price of the products of the farm, of the furnace, of the mill will return to what they were formerly; and then, and not until then, will the restoration of prosperity and good times come.

To cheer up the friends of ours who predicted the loss of our foreign trade, the following is printed here:

INCREASE IN FOREIGN TRADE—BUREAU OF STATISTICS SHOWS GAIN OF \$312,821,848 IN 1906—EXPORTS COVER \$171,257,148 AND IMPORTS \$141,564,700 OF THE ADDED BUSINESS OF THE YEAR.

The total value of the foreign trade of the United States in the calendar year 1906 was \$3,118,857,193, according to a bulletin issued by the Bureau of Statistics. This was an increase of \$312,821,848 over the total for the preceding year, of which \$171,257,148 was in exports and \$141,564,700 in imports. Manufactured articles imported exceeded those of the previous year by \$57,623,296, while articles partly manufactured increased \$53,244,462, and crude materials for manufacturing increased \$43,361,066.

The exports of manufactured articles show a comparative increase of \$50,251,469 and partly manufactured \$35,788,858, while foodstuffs, crude and manufactured, gained \$50,430,961.

The statistics under the different classifications and the increase or decrease, compared with the previous year, are:

IMPORTS.

Foodstuffs, \$278,638,299; decrease, \$14,662,450.
Crude materials, \$447,938,822; increase, \$43,361,066.
Partly manufactured, \$249,535,019; increase, \$53,244,462.
Manufactures, \$334,810,699; increase, \$57,623,296.
Miscellaneous, \$9,686,411; increase, \$1,898,335.
Total, \$1,320,609,250; increase, \$141,564,700.

EXPORTS.

Foodstuffs, \$521,312,722; increase, \$50,430,961.
Crude materials, \$524,902,516; increase, \$44,773,121.
Partly manufactured, \$248,897,752; increase, \$35,788,858.
Manufactures, \$470,033,393; increase, \$50,251,469.
Miscellaneous and reexports, \$33,101,560; increase, \$22,737.
Total, \$1,798,247,948; increase, \$171,257,148.

And again, a little differently stated, and it will be seen that our manufactured goods—

EXPORTS TOUCH NEW RECORD—UNITED STATES SENDS OUT ENORMOUS LOT OF MANUFACTURES—DURING YEAR JUST ENDED INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS AMOUNTED TO \$700,000,000.

Exports of manufactures from the United States in the year just ended aggregated more than \$700,000,000. Ten years ago, in the fiscal year 1896, they amounted to but \$258,000,000. In 1886, but \$145,000,000, and in 1876, \$105,000,000. The share which manufactures formed of the total exports was 42 per cent, this being three and one-half times as great as a decade ago.

This is the first time that exports of manufactures have ever approximated the \$700,000,000 line. Even in the fiscal year 1906, which is only six months away, the total exports of manufactures were but \$686,000,000. Thus these exports in the calendar year just closed are actually twice as great in value as in the fiscal year 1898.

The United States now holds third rank among nations as an exporter of manufactures. The total exports from the United Kingdom in 1905 were \$1,333,000,000, and from Germany \$910,000,000.

KENTUCKY.

Kentucky, the "bluegrass" State, comes next, and the utterance of her able and experienced son is useful to show the horrors that had defied the natural advantages of Kentucky and had prostrated the industrial classes of her people in the slough of despondency.

Mr. SMITH [March 31, 1897.] But it is claimed by its friends that this measure, when put into operation, will revolutionize the prevalent depressed state of business affairs, that in some mysterious and inexplicable manner it will supply all the arteries of commercial life with a richer and more abundant blood and vivify and regenerate the dead and languishing industries of the country. In the providence of God I trust it will, but in the weakness of my mental perception I am unable to see how and why it will be competent to bring the blessings prophesied of it. If I could be made to see that it would fulfill the apparent expectations of its advocates, I would go quickly to its support, and so far as my effort could achieve it, would hasten the day and the hour when my country would enjoy the fruition of the wise and faithful service that led to its adoption. * * * Stagnation and depression rule with despotic sway in every department of business life. Able, enterprising, and cautious men have been swept into the vortex of hopeless and irretrievable insolvency.

Want and penury are visible in the faces of countless thousands who wander up and down the streets of the great metropolitan cities in search of employment that can not be had at any price, and in numberless homes, erstwhile radiant with the glow of success and contentment, there are now the somber hues of discontent and destitution. The bounteous crops of the farmers, the bone and sinew of the Republic, instead of smiling with the gentle assurances of fair reward to them who have through sunshine and shower nurtured and developed them, are now heaving with sighs of disappointment and vocal with the moans of despair, and, in short, the deepening shadows of a long-continued but ever more furious financial storm still hover over and around the great masses of our population. It is as impossible to re-instate the former level of prices by the enactment of this measure as it is to enter the pearly gates of the New Jerusalem by the commission of the unpardonable sin.

Not one statement of the existing conditions was an exaggeration. Not one prophecy was fulfilled. Not one warning but failed of performance, and the whole extract aptly illustrates the phrensy of fear that seized upon our Democratic friends.

And now Tennessee:

Mr. BATE [July 6, 1897]. There comes on the wind from every section of the country the wail of an impoverished people. They demand relief, but they get increased taxation; they ask for bread, and you give them a stone; you mock at their distress and laugh at their suffering with this bill of increased taxes. * * * Prosperity can not be as-

sured by any law the repeal of which will be the urgent necessity for the great body of taxpayers. * * * I stand here, Mr. President, the advocate of fair trade and free silver. * * * By no other combination of revenue and currency can the great object of relief to the people be accomplished. * * * We can not burden the sale of foreign goods without embarrassing the sale of American products, and this bill, which is to make us the Ishmael among nations, will, I fear, intensify the distress and depression that already exist in every agricultural part of the Union.

Mr. McMILLIN [March 24, 1897]. Mr. Chairman, of all the futile efforts to delude that I have ever seen this is the most glaring. A large per cent of our population is farmers. They are the ones who bear the burdens and get no benefits. * * * Ruin is abroad in the land, and it is not confined to any particular vocation. The bank doors are closing and bank presidents are going to Canada and the penitentiary. * * * Out in the West the bins and reservoirs of industry are bursting with the wheat and corn for which there is no market. * * * What have they proposed for the farmers? To tax them more. * * * Mr. Chairman, after a careful and painstaking examination of this bill, I do not hesitate to declare it the most unconscionable effort at legislative robbery ever attempted upon a people. Neither the great fire of Chicago nor of Boston, nor the fearful flood that now devastates the Southland, could begin to compare with it as a calamity.

Mr. GAINES [July 19, 1897]. Mr. Speaker, I arraign the Republican party at the bar of public opinion upon indictment preferred by an outraged people, and charge it with the foul murder of the agricultural interests of this country. * * * In sustaining this indictment for the foul assassination of the farming interests of the country, I am not called upon to prove the corpus delicti, for the corpse lies stretched and mangled before the jury. * * * I call upon the Republican party to answer for the desolation and penury that obtain in rural homes in this fair land where once was plenty and contentment; and in the name of this people, who constitute the bone and blood and brain of the country, I demand that legislation in this Chamber be directed in their behalf. * * * The toilers at the plow handles are the body of the people, and in their name I charge you with the foul assaults this bill makes upon their interests and demand that their affairs have some consideration.

Mr. CARMACK [March 22, 1897]. The farmer, while thus compelled to sell in open competition with all the world, must buy the necessities of life in a market where protection laws exclude competition from abroad and trusts and combines have strangled competition at home. He is thus ground between the upper and nether millstone of competition and monopoly and crucified between the foreign pauper and the American thief. [Laughter and loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PIERCE [March 31, 1897]. A protective tariff can be of no benefit whatever to the farmers that I have the honor to represent upon this floor. * * * While you make the farmer pay the increased rates which are given as a bonus to the protected manufacturing interests of this country, at the same time you force him to sell his products in a foreign market where no protection can reach him or do him any good. * * * I say, then, to you that the people of this country registered their verdict against the McKinley law by a storm which swept the Republican party from off the political field, but that storm was but a zephyr in comparison with the storm that will sweep Republicanism out of existence in this Hall in 1898. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We have stood the storm and have emerged under the gentle voice of the Dingley bill—"peace, be still"—and the waves of Democratic horrors have subsided and the great State of Tennessee, is to-day enjoying a condition of prosperity she never had before.

Hear now from the grand old mother of Presidents—Virginia:

Mr. SWANSON [March 23, 1897]. * * * Each of these recurring years has brought times harder than the preceding; each brought greater business depression, greater fall in prices, greater poverty. Increasing debt and distress have come along with increased industry and frugality. The people's woes have grown despite the largest agricultural crops ever produced. * * * In less than four years, in time of profound peace, with bountiful crops and harvests, two extraordinary sessions of Congress have been called to furnish measures of relief to a suffering people. * * * The Wilson bill has been a benefit and not a detriment. The curse of the country has been the gold standard, and not reduced tariff taxes. * * * The passage of this bill means to destroy this vast (foreign) trade, which is fast increasing each year. It means an abandonment by the United States of the markets of the world. It means on our part a policy of isolation instead of one of progress and enterprise. * * * The decreased importation of foreign goods under the Wilson bill also shows that the manufacturer, under a low revenue tariff, is better able to control the home market. * * * The manufacturer is suffering, as everybody else has suffered, not from lower tariff taxes, for this has been beneficial, but on account of falling prices resulting from the appreciation of money which the existence of the gold standard has produced. * * * There can be no return of prosperity to the furnaces and mills, as there can be none to the farmers, until there is a restoration of prices. The demand (for gold) can only be lessened by creating a demand for silver equal with gold, which will occur when we give silver equal rights as money. When this is done, then the price of the products of the farm, of the furnace, of the mill, will return to what they were formerly; and then, and not until then, will the restoration of prosperity and good times come. This is our view on this side of the Chamber, and no other view which has been promulgated will bear the test of examination. [Applause.] * * * A prohibitive tariff is but the bestowal of special privileges on the manufacturer. Gold monometallism is but the bestowal of special privileges on the moneyed classes. We are opposed to both. [Prolonged applause.]

And now comes the growing and now prosperous State of Arkansas, and testifies to the horrors of Democratic control:

Mr. LITTLE [March 24, 1897]. The farmer has long since learned that whether there is a high tariff or low tariff, or no tariff at all, the value of everything he raises to sell and all his property, including his lands, have continued to decrease in value for the last twenty years, and the only effect the tariff tax can have upon him is to increase his burdens. The last campaign, Mr. Chairman, was made not upon the tariff issue, but upon the money question. * * * There were 6,500,000 unpurchasable freemen who cast patriotic ballots for William Jennings Bryan, their Constitution, and their country. * * *

With prosperity restored to the agricultural and industrial classes of the people, to whom you must look for a market for the product of your factories, you could rekindle your furnaces and give constant employment to your laborers; but as long as want and distress pervade this great body of consumers of your products you may start your factories, but you will be compelled to again close them, because your consumers are not able to buy. Abandon this short-sighted and ruinous policy and join us in our efforts to restore a policy of justice and equality toward all the people.

Mr. DIXMORE [March 30, 1897]. You will be judged by the merits of this bill. You will be held responsible by the American people for this bill when it becomes a law. I am no prophet; I do not desire to indulge in prophecy; I never do so. But I do claim the privilege of saying in behalf of the people I have the honor to represent that in my judgment this bill is going to be a failure, and will not bring to the people the prosperity you have promised. * * * The Republican party has yet to learn, it seems, that all prosperity in this country depends upon successful agriculture, and unless the farmer prospers he has not the wherewithal to buy the manufacturer's product. All depends upon the farmer, practically all, and yet he is the one ignored. * * * There will never be international agreement, but there will be bimetalism in the country; there will be free, unlimited, and independent coinage of silver, and then there will be prosperity. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BRUNDIDGE [March 24, 1897]. They—

His constituents—

have already in the past few years witnessed the depreciation in value of their homes, their farms, and every vestige of property that they own. * * * The products of their farms and shops are not worth in the market the cost of production, their children, in many instances, have been forced from the schoolroom to the fields, and upon every hand can be heard murmurings of hard and distressing times. And, Mr. Chairman, this condition exists over a broader area of the South and West than most people are willing to admit; but it is their privilege and duty through their Representatives in this House to resent as unwarranted and denounce as a crime the present effort to still further exact and wring from them the fruits of their labor. * * * Let the wolf no longer conceal his identity. Unmask the robber in order that the people of this country may know by what means the poor are to be made poorer and the rich richer. * * * There is but one industry that will be materially benefited. You will fill the land again with idlers; you will drive them to strong drink; you will increase the consumption of whisky, and fill our poorhouses with paupers and our asylums with maniacs. You may damn their souls, but upon your shoulders must rest the awful consequences of such legislation. * * * And you may pass this bill, as pass it you will, entailing its additional and manifold burdens and hardships upon this country. But I warn you that soon a day of reckoning will come. An unseen but mighty hand is to-day writing upon the hearts of the American people the great death sentence of the Republican party, and in four short years—I believe in two—they will rise up and by an uncorrupted and uncoerced ballot they will say to you in the language of that greatest of all books: "You have been weighed in the balance and found wanting; this year thou shalt die."

Yet we live! The prophecy that the Dingley bill would drive the people to drink is not sustained, and yet doubtless the conditions existing at the time the gentleman spoke may have made it easier for some men to gratify their bibulous tendencies.

INDIANA.

The Hoosier State now testifies:

Mr. ROBINSON [July 19, 1897]. Mr. Speaker, this is a fitting time indeed—at the dead hour of the night—to pass this bill that covers with a blanket mortgage in favor of wealth the future profits of honest toil. * * * During the campaign the majority on that side said that the depression was not the result of industrial conditions, but the fruit of a lack of confidence; that business stood ready to embark as soon as the discussion was over and the President elected. The President was elected, but the elusive goddess was nowhere to be seen. Then it was said: "Give the Administration a chance. The President has not yet been inaugurated; when he is, all will be well." The event over, the hand of depression grew still heavier upon us. Then they said: "Wait till the tariff bill is passed." And now, as we stand on the threshold of this false mansion of manifold calamities and false promises, our ears are disturbed to frenzy by the walls of more starving miners striking for bread, industrial depression deeper and more disastrous, bankruptcy, and battle for existence all over the land. * * * Sir, they have played upon the soft lute of hope so long that patience has ceased to be a virtue, and the imprisoned spirit of a long-suffering and deluded people clearly sees the hypocrisy of their pretensions.

Mr. MIERS [March 25, 1897]. I have the honor to represent one of the best agricultural districts in the State of Indiana. Business there is so depressed that tenants and even owners of large farms, that will yield as much corn, wheat, or oats per acre as any land in the United States and can be produced with as little labor and expense, can not afford to raise the products of the farm and put them on the market. * * * This is true of the very best farmers all over Indiana and of the great West. Our people want relief, and want it quickly and need it badly. * * * Our competitors have enjoyed a protective bounty equivalent to the premium on gold as measured by silver. There is but one way to destroy this bounty; that is to restore bimetalism, reestablish the old parity between the two metals, and cause the premium on gold as measured by silver to disappear. * * * Nothing else can open the way to prosperity; no tariff, unless it carried with it an amendment opening our mints to free silver coinage, can bring prosperity to either farmers or the manufacturers. Mills and factories are idle, not because foreign mills are running in their places, not because the farmers are buying foreign goods in place of goods of our own making, but because they are not buying as freely as they used to. They can not buy freely until they get better prices for their products; they can not get better prices as long as we adhere to the gold standard. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Here again is an admission of the bad conditions in which we found the country in 1893. Contrast this admitted condition with the present, when the farmer is growing richer than he ever dreamed of being in the good old Democratic days.

Here is added some most valuable testimony to the present good condition of the South. It is a brief extract from the official report of the late lamented president of the great Southern Railroad, Samuel Spencer, than whom the South had no abler or better man. In accounting for the almost phenomenal growth of his railroad he said:

One exceedingly potential cause is the extraordinary industrial development of the South. In his last public address, the late president of this company, Mr. Samuel Spencer, referred to this development as follows:

"The South has entered upon a period of increased production in agriculture and in manufactures, and of general industrial and commercial activity, such as her best friends and most enthusiastic prophets had scarcely dreamed of fifteen years ago. Within that period the cash value of her cotton crop has doubled, the amount of pig iron produced at her furnaces has increased enormously, and the product of her coal mines has increased more than threefold. Cotton factories have sprung up within her borders to the extent that more of her cotton crop is now manufactured on her own soil than in all the mills of New England. The total value of her annual manufactures now aggregates nearly eighteen hundred millions. The total value of her agricultural products is now over seventeen hundred millions per annum."

This increase is likewise indicated in the volume of traffic handled by this company. In 1895 the number of tons of freight carried 1 mile was 1,098,932,884, while in 1906 the number of tons carried 1 mile was 4,488,915,839, showing an increase of over 300 per cent, or, allowing for the increased mileage, an increase of over 138 per cent; while in 1895 the number of passengers hauled 1 mile was 178,015,925 as against 549,518,645 in 1906, showing an increase of over 200 per cent, or, allowing for the increased mileage, an increase per mile of road of over 80 per cent.

Nowhere in the United States, except in the two States of the extreme Northwest, Washington and Oregon, has there been such industrial development as in the South.

THE OTHER SIDE.

Here I give some extracts from some Democratic speeches. They come from Louisiana:

Mr. MEYER. [March 25, 1897.] It may be and probably is true that without some well-considered measure of currency and financial reform no tariff adjustment can fully restore our prosperity as a people and revive our stagnant industries; but, as a Representative of Louisiana, representing great and suffering interests which so vitally concern the welfare of my district, and indeed our whole State, I can not hesitate as to my duty, and that is to aid in every way to have these important schedules become the law of the land as soon as practicable, and I shall rejoice to witness the benefits which it will confer on Louisiana. * * *

Mr. MCENERY. [June 12, 1897.] Louisiana is vitally interested in the production of salt, lumber, rice, sugar, and cotton. The pending bill makes no discrimination in the arrangement of the schedules for revenue against these products. Why should she stand idly by and decline to accept the benefits to be derived from the necessary levying of revenue by impost duties? Call it what you will, protection or a revenue tariff with incidental protection, millions of dollars have to be raised and the benefits of protection from it distributed. Why, then, should the people of Louisiana resist the building of cotton factories, furniture factories, the erection of sawmills, the opening and improving of sugar fields, and the erection of central factories, the opening of salt mines, and hundreds of other industries that are just now coming into existence? * * * The South is more interested in the proper levying of a tariff than any other section of the country. Her development in manufacturing interests in the last two decades has been marvelous. This has been in spite of free-trade ideas and free-trade policy. Had there been a demand for adequate protection to her cotton mills, her wealth would have been doubled.

Field and factory, the spindle and the plow, being in close relationship, would have doubled her productive capacity, would have given tenfold value to her lands, would have multiplied her population with an intelligent and industrious people, would have rescued her from debt, and there would be now no borrowing from foreign mortgage syndicates, where principals are doubled in five years by usurious interest. * * * I stand to-day with Jefferson and Jackson on the tariff issue, founded on sound constitutional interpretations. * * * The South has been solidly Democratic from necessity. * * * In Louisiana many of those who acted promptly and effectively in overthrowing carpetbag government were men who had been reared and educated in the Whig school of politics. They were and are Democrats whose services to the party are not less than those of any Democrat in the Union. These men hold to the views that I have but indifferently expressed. * * * We are not, and I hope we will never be, called upon again to make our choice between allegiance to Federal and State government; but in all the material interests which affect Louisiana, in all matters of legislation which will promote her interests, when the choice is presented to me of voting for them or party measures which would lay her fair surface bare and desolate, I have no hesitation in saying—and I utter the statement with the proudest satisfaction—that I will, regardless of party discipline, vote in favor of any measure that will bring prosperity to my State. * * * The people accepted the Republican promise of relief by tariff legislation. I believe we should respect the wishes of the people and interpose no objection to the means of relief which this party offered and which the people accepted. We ought to endeavor, as far as conscience will permit, to carry out the will of the people. If we were sincere in our demands for the relief of the people, to lift the heavy burden from them which they have borne so long, we should not reject the relief which was promised and which they accepted, no matter from what source it comes.

And four Representatives from Louisiana, to wit, Messrs. MEYER, DAVEY, BROUSSARD, and Price, voted for the Dingley bill. And I have not heard that they have ever regretted their act.

It is not my purpose to discuss the various questions that have arisen in connection with the subject-matter of this argument. The enemies of the protective tariff system of to-day are made up of men holding various and widely divergent opinions, but all of them hostile to the principle of protection. They may be classed as follows: First, free-traders, persons opposed to the levying of tariff duties, the men who preach the doctrine of

absolute free trade. This body is made up of all sorts of people—Democrats, mugwumps, students of politics and philosophy, and so on. Then come the reciprocity men, the men who want to swap trade. You will generally find, however, that these men or their friends want reciprocity to apply especially to their own trade or manufacture. Then the revisionist, the man who says the tariff ought to be revised. Upward or downward? Oh, he never discusses that question; let us have a revision. Then comes the so-called "stand-patter," a term which has been applied to those who believe that the conditions should not be disturbed at the present time. The men who stood for the Dingley law at its enactment have never taken the ground that the act was so perfect in all its details that no changes in the schedules would ever be tolerated, except as changes might be forced by the overthrow of the Republican party of protection. Time, the fluctuations of trade, and manufacture change conditions, and naturally and necessarily there are items in the schedules of the Dingley bill that might well be changed, some higher, some lower, but they are not of such striking importance as to demand the sudden overthrow of present conditions and the reversal of present policies, and, above all things, there ought not to be any general revision of the tariff pending a Presidential election. Let us elect another Congress with the President, and then, if deemed necessary, let us enter upon a general revision of the tariff. Until then let us stand by the enactment that is bringing such boundless prosperity to our country. The principle of protection is engraved deeply in the good opinions of the wise men of the country, and it will be a sad day for American independence in the markets of the world and for American prosperity in the home markets of our country when it shall be repealed and repudiated.

There are others along that line.

Then came Louisiana always voting the Democratic ticket and always arguing in favor of the Republican tariff. Here is a speech of Mr. MEYER which I will publish, and of their venerable Senator, both proposing to accept the Dingley bill as a probable benefit to the country. Neither one of them, I believe, voted for it, but we forced it upon them as we always force prosperity upon our outlying country to the South.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am sure the House is tired, and I will pause here simply to ask permission of the House to publish certain tables stating the prices of corn, wheat, and all sorts of farm products during the several years since 1892; also the domestic prices of certain articles; also the prices of labor and the cost of living and a great many other statistics that relate to the subject-matter of my speech. I ask unanimous consent to publish these papers as a part of my remarks. So, Mr. Chairman, I conclude where I began, that however patriotic the Democratic party may be through its Representatives, however anxious they may be for the welfare of the people—and I do not criticize them in any respect whatever from that standpoint—their long adherence to a mistake in American politics, their long devotion to an idea that has been so often repudiated by the very fact that they themselves have challenged, has made it important and carries a lesson with it that can not be shunted aside or disobeyed, that the declarations of the Democratic party in Congress, or anywhere else, are not a safe guide for the people of my country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. BIRDSALL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution of the following title:

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution extending protection of second proviso of section 1 of the act of December 21, 1904, to certain entrymen.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 21574) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 222, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. CULLOM, Mr. WARREN, and Mr. TELLER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, on Wednesday last the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. FOSTER] engaged in an able and learned discussion of the subject of the treaty-making power, and on yesterday we listened to a clear exposition of the same question by the distinguished and learned lawyer the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY]. The conclusion drawn from the authorities quoted by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. FOSTER] seems to be that by means of a treaty the Federal Government may legislate—indeed, has legislated—upon subjects which are generally supposed to have been reserved to the States. The impression conveyed was, although this was not directly stated by the gentleman, that at least in some cases the Federal Government could make encroachments upon the States through the treaty-making power when the Congress of the United States, expressing itself by means of a statute, would be held by the courts to be exercising powers not granted to it by the Constitution.

I think the authorities cited by the gentleman do not fully support this claim. On the contrary, it seems to be pretty well settled that the President and the Senate can make no treaty which the Congress of the United States could not afterwards supplement, alter, or repeal by a statute.

Although this has never been directly decided by the Federal courts, still the decisions on the treaty-making power lead very strongly to the conclusion that a treaty as well as a statute of the United States has no validity unless the power to deal with the subject-matter of it is conferred expressly or by necessary implication by the Constitution. There seems to be nothing in the authorities to give color to the claim that a treaty may invade territory from which the statute passed by Congress is excluded.

In the case of *Fong Yue Ting v. United States* (149 U. S., 721) Mr. Justice Gray, delivering the opinion of the court, says:

A treaty, it is true, is in its nature a contract between nations, and is often merely promissory in its character, requiring legislation to carry its stipulations into effect. Such legislation will be open to future repeal or amendment. If the treaty operates by its own force and relates to a subject within the power of Congress, it can be deemed in that particular only the equivalent of a legislative act, to be repealed or modified at the pleasure of Congress. In either case the last expression of the sovereign will must control.

So far as a treaty made by the United States with any foreign nation can become the subject of judicial cognizance in the courts of this country, it is subject to such acts as Congress may pass for its enforcement, modification, or repeal.

That the power to regulate the relations of the United States with foreign countries and the intercourse of the citizens of our own and other nations has been granted by the Constitution to the Federal Government can not, of course, be denied. That treaties made or statutes passed by the Federal Government for the purpose of such regulation must be held paramount over the constitution, laws, or local ordinances of any State must be admitted. But it may at least be doubted whether under the Constitution the treaty-making power of the Government could legislate by a treaty to take away the reserved rights of the States in a case where the Congress of the United States could not constitutionally do so. The case of *Fong Yue Ting*, above quoted, and several others that might be cited, seem to establish the principle that a treaty which requires no legislation to put it in force, but operates of itself, is to be regarded only as the equivalent of a statute, and that the Executive and the Senate can make no treaty in regard to the rights of aliens that could not be modified or wholly abrogated by a subsequent act of Congress. It would therefore seem to follow that the authority to make a treaty under the Constitution must be discovered by exactly the same process as the authority to pass a statute. The grant of power to make treaties, I venture to assert, must be exercised like any other power conferred upon any branch of the Federal Government, not as if it were the only grant contained in the instrument, but in full view of all the other provisions and subject to all the limitations of the Constitution, in order to give them all operation and authority. The provision of the Constitution reserving to the States or to the people all powers not granted to the Federal Government must be just as binding upon the treaty-making power as upon any other branch of the Government. Any other doctrine would be revolutionary in its tendency.

In view of these principles, most of which are well settled by the decisions of the courts, what shall be said of the right claimed for the treaty-making power of the United States by a treaty with a foreign government to force the citizens of a State to tax themselves to maintain schools for the education of the children of unnaturalized aliens temporarily residing in such State? To come down to the specific case which has called forth this discussion of the extent of the treaty-making power, could the Executive and the Senate of the United States make a valid treaty with Japan under which the President of the United States could lawfully employ the Army and the Navy to compel

the people of California or any municipality therein to tax themselves to furnish free education for the children of such unnaturalized subjects of the Mikado as might happen to be residing in such State or municipality? The provision of the Constitution that "direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers," ought, it would seem, to set that question at rest. No one will probably claim that the Federal Government could constitutionally levy direct taxes upon the people of California for the purpose of establishing and maintaining schools in which to educate the subjects of Japan sojourning in California; nor could Congress pass any law compelling the levying of such direct taxes by the several States for such purpose. Where is the authority for claiming that the Federal Government may in this respect do by indirection, through a treaty, what it can not do directly? If the expense of maintaining the schools of California or any part of it was borne by the Federal Government there might be at least some basis for such a claim.

The gentleman from Vermont admits that California is under no obligation to the General Government to maintain schools or to educate anybody. But he states, "that the treaty-making power of the National Government can by treaty stipulation provide that the subjects of Japan may enjoy in the State of California, equally with the citizens of the State, such public schools as the State of California does maintain." Whether the treaty-making power could do this is at least subject to very grave doubt. Certainly no decision cited by the gentleman or any decision that I can find goes so far. All the decisions which he cited in support of this contention relate to the right of the alien to own, enjoy, and transfer property, to the right to labor for a livelihood, and generally the right to protection and to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Nearly all of these rights are guaranteed to all persons within the jurisdiction of the several States by the Federal Constitution, and are very different from a privilege enjoyed, for example, by the people of California, and for which they themselves pay. Between property rights—between those imperative rights guaranteed by the Constitution and the local privileges enjoyed by the people of California, for which they tax themselves and of which they may at will deprive themselves—there is a wide and most radical difference. If the Federal Government may by treaty or otherwise constitutionally invade these local privileges and dictate how they shall be enjoyed and who shall enjoy them, as yet the courts have not judicially determined that this is the supreme law of the land.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose at this time to enter upon any extended discussion of these constitutional questions, but I believe the time has come when I may discuss dispassionately and briefly the recent incidents in our history which have called forth these discussions. The recent San Francisco school incident, happily for the people of California, does not involve any of these constitutional questions, because when the facts are understood it will be found that San Francisco has not violated the treaty between this country and Japan. The only part of the treaty of 1894 between this country and Japan upon which any claim of violation could be based reads as follows:

In whatever relates to rights of residence and travel, to the possession of goods and effects of any kind, to the succession to personal estate by will or otherwise, and the disposal of property of any sort and in any manner whatsoever, which they may lawfully acquire, the citizens or subjects of each contracting party shall enjoy in the territories of the other the same privileges, liberties, and rights and shall be subject to no higher imposts or charges in these respects than native citizens or subjects or citizens or subjects of the most-favored nation.

It is claimed by some that the right of residence thus granted to the citizens of Japan implies not only the right of all Japanese children to education in the public schools in this country and at public expense, but also the right to education in the same schools as the children of our own citizens or those of other foreign countries. In other words, it is claimed that under this treaty when a citizen of Japan comes to this country and takes up a temporary residence, as a matter of international right he can force himself or his children into any public school in the land without any reference to local or State laws, regulations, or customs. If this claim of Japan should be held to be well founded, before long we may expect to see Japan insisting that her treaty rights have been invaded and her citizens discriminated against, because we naturalize the subjects of Germany, for example, put them on the police force, and even send them to Congress, and the like privileges are not extended to citizens of Japan. In nearly every municipality in this country where there is any considerable percentage of colored population the colored school children are segregated from those of white parentage, yet under this claim of Japan her citizens are not to be held as bound by local school laws and regulations which have universally been held to be constitutional and proper and binding upon our citizens of colored blood.

But the assumption that the treaty of 1894 intended to give and does give to the subjects of Japan the right to free education is a violent one not warranted by the language of the treaty itself. The rights conferred by the treaty are clearly and specifically enumerated and the right to free public education is not among them. It should also be borne in mind that under our law Japanese can not become citizens, and therefore neither the United States nor the State of California would be chargeable with a duty to educate in order to prepare the future citizen for the duties and responsibilities of citizenship.

Even admitting that the treaty of 1894 does give to Japanese subjects equal opportunities for education in the public schools as our own citizens, still the board of education in segregating the children of Japanese parentage from the white children has violated no treaty and done no wrong. The Civil Code of California, section 1662, reads as follows:

(School.) Trustees shall have the power to exclude children of filthy or vicious habits, or children suffering from contagious or infectious diseases, and also to establish separate schools for Indian children and for children of Mongolian or Chinese descent. When such separate schools are established, Indian, Chinese, or Mongolian children must not be admitted into any other school.

In accordance with this statute, many years ago a separate school was established in San Francisco and has since been maintained for the education of Chinese children, called the oriental school. Since this separate school was established, in accordance with the positive mandate of the statute that "Indian, Chinese, or Mongolian children must not be admitted to any other school," the San Francisco school board had no alternative; it was obliged, under the law, to assign the Japanese children to the oriental school. Some unfavorable comment has been caused because there were only 93 Japanese children affected by the order of the board assigning them to the oriental school, 25 of whom were native born. If there were but 9 such children, the case would be the same; it was the duty of the board to assign them to the oriental school. This school is centrally located, as well equipped and with as competent teachers as any in the city. Chinese have been attending the oriental school for years, and nobody has discovered that their segregation was "a wicked absurdity."

Was it legal and proper for California or the school authorities of San Francisco to segregate the native-born school children of Mongolian descent, establish separate schools for them, and forbid them to attend the schools maintained for white children? There is not a particle of doubt that the San Francisco school board had a perfect legal right to do this. In *Roberts v. City of Boston* (5 Cushing, 198) it appeared that 160 primary schools were maintained in that city, and of this number two were devoted to the exclusive use of colored children and the balance to the exclusive use of white children. The opinion of the court, delivered by Chief Justice Shaw, held this to be legal and proper. *Ward v. Flood*, 48 Cal., 36, was an exactly similar case. The court approves the doctrine of the case of *Roberts v. City of Boston*, and holds that the exclusion of the colored children from the white schools was legal and proper. In *State v. McCann* (21 Ohio St., 198) it appeared that a colored school had been established, organized out of several adjoining districts for colored children, and they were excluded from the schools attended by white children. Action was brought to compel the admission of these colored children to the white schools. This application was denied and the court in its opinion uses this language:

The plaintiff, then, can not claim that his privileges are abridged on the ground of inequality of school advantages for his children. Nor can he dictate where his children shall be instructed, or what teacher shall perform that office, without obtaining privileges not enjoyed by white citizens. Equality of rights does not involve the necessity of educating white and colored persons in the same school any more than it does that of educating children of both sexes in the same school.

The same doctrine is held in *People ex rel. King v. Gallagher* (93 New York, 438). The decisions of practically all the courts of the land down to the present time on this subject are in harmony with these principles.

It being, therefore, perfectly legal and proper for California and San Francisco to do just what has been done in the way of segregation of its native-born children of oriental descent, will it be claimed that the subjects of Japan have a right to education in white schools in defiance of the laws of California and the ordinance of San Francisco, which are binding upon native American citizens of oriental blood?

If it shall be decided that Japanese children have this right under the treaty, such decision would have far-reaching effects. For example, here in Washington the colored children are segregated and taught in separate schools, and are not allowed to attend the schools maintained for white children exclusively. There is in our treaty with Great Britain a provision very similar to the one I have quoted from the treaty with Japan. If

Japan and her friends are correct in their claim, the colored subjects of Great Britain from Jamaica or the Bermudas could come to Washington and insist upon attending the white schools here in spite of the school authorities of the District, or even of the Congress of the United States itself. A subject of Great Britain of Chinese descent from Hongkong could come to San Francisco and, refusing to attend the oriental school provided for him, could enlist the Federal Government, if necessary, to compel the white schools of that city to receive and teach him in defiance of the local authorities.

But the treaty clearly does not undertake to grant such right. The gentleman from Vermont admits that never in the history of our diplomacy has the treaty-making power undertaken to give to aliens rights above those enjoyed by our own citizens. I think it may confidently be asserted that the treaty-making power of the United States has never intended to make and has never made a treaty with Japan under which a citizen of Japan, on becoming a temporary resident of this country, by that act acquires the right to dictate to an American city how its public schools shall be run. If the treaty-making power should ever drift so far from our traditions and the popular conceptions of the powers of the Federal Government as to make such a treaty, I hope, for the sake of the right of local self-government, justly dear to the American people and jealously guarded by the citizens of all sections, that the courts would hold it, like a statute undertaking to accomplish the same result, unconstitutional, and therefore void.

Since San Francisco and California in this Japanese school matter have only followed established and long-approved precedents, wherefore all this denunciation and abuse? Of what crime is California guilty to deserve the threat of the President of the United States to send against her people the armed forces of the United States? Mr. Chairman, she is guilty of desiring to remain American. Her sole offense is that she is strong in the determination to maintain within her borders the civilization of the Caucasian race. Her only crime is that she is trying to go forward with the working out of the national and social and moral ideals of our fathers and is sending out a strong cry against the orientalizing of the Pacific coast by the sons of Nippon or by any other Asiatic immigrants.

The people of California feel no hatred of Japan as a nation nor of the Japanese coolies who have been lately coming to their State in large numbers. As a Representative of California upon this floor I hesitate to say words that might be thought unkind by our Japanese friends. But the people of California know that the ideals of most of the Japanese who have come among them are not American ideals; their ways are not our ways. Theirs is a race different and distinct from ours; very different physically, with a different religion, entirely different traditions reaching back for centuries, different ideas of the family life; and in many ways their viewpoint is totally different from ours. Any attempt to amalgamate these Japanese coolies with our stock would give rise to race problems more difficult of solution than our brothers of the South are now trying to solve. Although the Japanese have been coming to California in numbers for about seven years, there is yet no sign of the establishment of any social relations between them and any element of our population, and I feel sure from what I know of the Japanese character that no matter how long they stay, or whether born on our soil or in Japan, they will continue alien and distinctively Japanese and not American. The leopard can not change his spots. The Creator made the two races different, and different they will remain. I am aware that there is the highest authority for asserting that "God hath made of one blood all the nations of the earth," and the same high authority has intimated that it is a good and pleasant thing for brethren to dwell together in unity, but there is not a single example in history of two peoples, racially widely different, living together in peace, unless one race was subject to the other or the two races were amalgamated. Under our form of government one race can not live in legal subjection to the other, and I think all students of the subject agree that the Japanese can not be assimilated.

In discussing Japanese immigration in California appeals to selfish interests and commercial considerations are most often heard. But this question should be settled upon higher grounds than these. In the light of our experience of the last hundred years, if the negro inhabitants of this country numbered only 100,000, confined to two or three States along the Atlantic seaboard, would we welcome the coming from Africa of large numbers of colored immigrants until they reached a total of millions? I believe that nearly every thinking American will answer this question in the negative. Yet this supposititious case is exactly parallel with the conditions now existing on the Pacific coast in Japanese immigration. With the race problem of the South before them it seems clear that the people of the

United States should steadfastly exclude from permanent residence and citizenship in large numbers any race which can not be readily amalgamated with our own stock. But even if assimilation of the Japanese coming to this country would take place easily and rapidly, is such assimilation desirable? What strength or grace of body or mind not already possessed by our people could this totally dissimilar race bring to us? They are certainly much inferior to us physically, and there is the highest scientific authority for claiming that such assimilation would bring only evil. In this connection I beg to quote Herbert Spencer. In his famous letter to Baron Kaneko Kentaro, Mr. Spencer said:

To your remaining question respecting the intermarriage of foreigners and Japanese, which you say is "now very much agitated among our scholars and politicians," and which you say is "one of the most difficult problems," my reply is that, as rationally answered, there is no difficulty at all. *It should be positively forbidden.* It is not at root a question of social philosophy. It is at root a question of biology. There is abundant proof, alike furnished by the intermarriage of human races and by the interbreeding of animals, that when the varieties mingled diverge beyond a certain slight degree, the result is inevitably a bad one in the long run. I have myself been in the habit of looking at the evidence bearing on this matter for many years past, and my conviction is based on numerous facts derived from numerous sources. This conviction I have within the last half hour verified, for I happen to be staying in the country with a gentleman who is well known and has had much experience respecting the interbreeding of cattle; and he has just, on inquiry, fully confirmed my belief that when, say, of the different varieties of sheep, there is an interbreeding of those which are widely unlike, the result, especially in the second generation, is a bad one—there arises an incalculable mixture of traits and what may be called a chaotic constitution. And the same thing happens among human beings—the Eurasians in India, the half-breed in America show this. The physiological basis of this experience appears to be that any one variety of creature in course of many generations acquires a certain constitutional adaption to its peculiar form of life, and every other variety similarly acquires its own special adaption. The consequence is that, if you mix the constitutions of two widely divergent varieties which have severally become adapted to widely divergent modes of life, you get a constitution which is adapted to the mode of life of neither—a constitution which will not work properly, because it is not fitted for any set of conditions whatever. *By all means, therefore, peremptorily interdict marriages of Japanese with foreigners.*

I have for the reasons indicated entirely approved of the regulations which have been established in America for restraining Chinese immigration, and had I the power I would restrict them to the smallest possible amount, my reasons for this decision being that one of two things must happen. If the Chinese are allowed to settle extensively in America they must either, if they remain unmixed, form a subjective race standing in the position, if not of slaves, yet of a class approaching slaves; or, if they mix, they must form a bad hybrid. In either case, supposing the immigration to be large, immense social mischief must arise and eventually social disorganization. The same thing would happen if there should be any considerable mixture of European or American races with the Japanese.

I quote also from another high authority, Pouchet. He says:

If we have endeavored to prove that the hybrids of distant races do not possess all the necessary conditions of animal life and of propagation, it would be easy to find numerous proofs in order to show that generally the intellectual conditions of hybrids are not much more satisfactory than their physical condition.

Doctor Tschudi says, in speaking of the Zambos (hybrids from the aborigines and negroes at Lima):

"As men they are greatly inferior to the pure races, and as members of society they are the worst class of citizens; they alone furnish four-fifths of the criminals in the prisons of Lima."

Mr. E. G. Squier has made the same observation about the Zambos of Nicaragua. In his part of the country the union of Spaniards with these same Americans seems to have only produced degenerate men, who show no capacity whatsoever for perfection."

According to these scientific lights, then, there are already too many mongrels in the world. Why should the United States consent to add to the stock by permitting a possible mixture of totally different races in the States on the Pacific slope?

Attempts have been made in a portion of the eastern press in this country to throw discredit upon the authoritative statement of Herbert Spencer, which I have just quoted, by showing that in this same letter Mr. Spencer took just as positive grounds upon other questions—questions of statesmanship and public policy then agitating the minds of the public men of Japan—which were entirely untenable and which experience has demonstrated to have been wholly wrong. The fact that Mr. Spencer made the mistake of leaving the subject of biology, in the study of which and kindred subjects he had spent his life, and going into other fields to speak with authority upon subjects about which he knew little or nothing should not be allowed to throw discredit upon his statement concerning a scientific matter upon which he was then the greatest living authority. He made the same mistake that some of our eminent American public men have recently been making by joining in condemnation of the sentiments of the people of California as wholly unworthy, and discussing with learned dogmatism Japanese immigration when they have never seen a Japanese coolie in their lives and have no practical knowledge of the subject whatever.

According to the bureau of labor statistics of California, last year the arrivals of Japanese at the port of San Francisco alone, in excess of departures, numbered nearly 1,000 per month.

This takes no account of the arrivals at other ports of the United States, nor of those who come in over the borders from Canada and Mexico. This year this net increase promises to be much more, and a high authority estimates that there are now 50,000 Japanese in California—nearly all male wage-earners. And yet many people in the East do not understand nor sympathize with the alarm with which the people of California view this increasing immigration. Members of this House have recently said to me, "Ten or fifteen thousand per year! That is nothing to cause alarm. Why, we are getting a million aliens a year from Europe over here in the East and think nothing of it." I beg to remind these gentlemen that we have in California about 2,000,000 people, one-fortieth of the population of the United States. Multiply 10,000 or 15,000, the number of yearly Japanese accessions to our population, by forty, and you have 400,000 to 600,000. Do these gentlemen suppose that if 400,000 to 600,000 Japanese coolies were annually landing in New York and spreading themselves over the States of the East, and this immigration was rapidly increasing, there would be no alarm and no protest by the people? I dare assert that as soon as the people east of the Rocky Mountains became acquainted by practical experience with the character of this immigration, and what its continued increase meant to our country, there would be an insistent demand for immediate exclusion legislation which would not be denied. But we are away off on the western rim of the continent, and our cry is small and faint, and the rest of the country is slow to hear and to heed.

But our alarm is not based alone on theory. At our very doors, in the Territory of Hawaii, we have an object lesson. By looking at the conditions there we can see what the Pacific coast is destined to become if the present temper of the Federal Government continues. Thirty years ago there were no Japanese worth mentioning in the Territory of Hawaii, yet to-day they are a majority of all the inhabitants of the islands. Doctor Neill, of the Bureau of Commerce and Labor, has recently compiled a very interesting report on conditions in Hawaii, which has been issued by the Department as Bulletin No. 66. This report shows that the Japanese, with the few Chinese and Koreans now in the islands, are doing 85 per cent of the plantation work and 75 per cent of the work in all other occupations, skilled and unskilled. American skilled labor will soon be driven from the islands, and unless conditions change the labor of the islands will finally be wholly monopolized by the Japanese. They have invaded all avocations there. Many of them are contractors, and 75 per cent of the merchants and traders of the islands are orientals. All that seems to remain to be done to make these islands a Japanese colony is to pull down the Stars and Stripes and hoist the flag of Japan.

The people of the Pacific coast are firm in the conviction that, unless the result is prevented by legislation, the Pacific coast in the next twenty-five years will certainly become as completely orientalized as Hawaii has been. Their conviction is based not wholly upon shadowy fears, nor even upon the experience of Hawaii, but they see this orientalizing process well on the way in parts of California. In the Vaca Valley, for example, from which has come for many years the earliest California fruits, this orientalizing process is well advanced toward completion. Only a few years ago the Japanese came in as laborers in the orchards, later they began to lease and then to buy the orchards, until now one-half the orchards of the fair Vaca Valley are owned or leased by Japanese. Five Japanese own orchards of some 200 acres and many others smaller amounts. The presence of Japanese in any numbers in any community brings the Japanese shopkeeper and trader, the Japanese banker, shoemaker, and Japanese engaged in every form of human employment, and these Japanese business houses get the trade of their countrymen to the exclusion of the white stores.

In Antioch I am advised that truck farming on the Tule lands is rapidly going through the same transformation, and in the raisin-growing districts of Fresno County it is already beginning. In that county one Japanese owns 320 acres of vineyard, another 160 acres, and others smaller amounts. Our people know that as the Jap already has the Vaca Valley so in a short time he will take the Antioch district and the Fresno region, as well as any other district that he chooses to invade.

The causes of these rapid and peaceful commercial conquests are several. In the first place, most Americans do not care to live in a neighborhood where a large percentage of the population is Japanese. They sell or lease their orchards or property at the best price they can get from Japanese or anyone else, and get out. The same thing takes place in San Francisco. When a crowd of Japanese rent a house in the residence portion of that city at once there is a great fall in the price of real estate—

in some cases as much as 50 per cent—and an exodus from the neighborhood begins.

But the chief cause for these rapid Japanese conquests is the fact that white labor can not compete with oriental, and especially with Japanese labor. Accustomed to live on a little rice and dried fish, to sleep on a board, and to do with very few of the comforts of life, no white man can hope to hold the field against him. We pass high-tariff laws to protect the American laborer against the products of cheap foreign labor. We Republicans have promised to protect him from this cheap labor. Shall we "keep this promise to the ear and break it to the hope" by permitting, not the products, but the cheapest laborers themselves to come and compete with him at his own door, under the very shadow of his home?

Accustomed at home to labor for a few cents a day, our wages in California seem to the Jap fabulously princely, and it is no wonder that he is eager to reach that land of promise. He is shrewd enough to get as much for his labor as he can, but when he invades a field he cuts under the ruling white wages enough to get the business. Thus the Jap has come to monopolize the labor of the fruit industry of the Vaca Valley, the seed industry of Santa Clara County, and the berry fields and orchards of Watsonville, and thus they will come to monopolize the labor of the Pacific coast, unless their coming be prevented in some way.

Some employers of labor are at first induced to employ Japanese by the temptation of securing cheap labor. But once in possession of the field they cease to be cheap, and no labor union ever was more despotic in its demands than a company of Japanese laborers secure in the possession of a particular field from which they have driven competition. Ask the planters of Hawaii if what I am saying is not true.

The Japanese contractor employs his countrymen at first almost at his own price. He boards his men in his shack at a total expense of \$5 or \$6 per month, and many of these coolies are in virtual slavery to pay for their passage across the Pacific and have little or nothing to say about what their wages shall be. Thus equipped, he starts, as he started in Hawaii, in a California city or town to get business. He will soon be enabled to drive the white contractor out of business or compel him to employ Japanese help. The same thing is true of the Japanese orchardist and truck farmer. He can make all kinds of money selling his product at prices that drive the American employing white labor to the wall. And so, unless arrested by legislation, the process of transforming the Pacific coast from an American into an oriental habitation will go on to its inevitable conclusion. What remedy does the Pacific coast propose for the correction of these present and future evils? We ask that the Chinese-exclusion act shall be extended to embrace Japanese and all other Asiatic laborers. The Asiatic coolie is the key to the situation. On the laborer as a foundation rests the oriental industrial structure, just as the industrial structure everywhere rests upon labor. Exclude the laborer and every other condition to which we object will correct itself.

Nearly one year ago in discussing this subject upon this floor my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] expressed the fear that if we should pass such legislation as the Pacific coast is asking we would have trouble, perhaps war, with Japan. Why should trouble come? The treaty of 1894 provides for such legislation. The provisions of the Chinese-exclusion act could be extended to embrace Japanese laborers without violating either in letter or spirit our treaty with Japan. The last paragraph of Article II of that treaty reads as follows:

It is, however, understood that the stipulations contained in this and the preceding article do not in any way affect the laws, ordinances, and regulations with regard to trade, the immigration of laborers, police and public security which are in force or which may hereafter be enacted in either of the two countries.

But how is Japan observing the terms of this treaty, under which she is demanding such extraordinary rights and privileges? Americans are not allowed to enter the schools of Japan. They are not allowed to own real estate or engage in mining there. If the business of an American resident of Japan requires him to own real property, he can not purchase or hold it except in the name of some Japanese subject. Should an American laborer go to Japan, he would not be allowed to work unless he procured a license from the prefecture of the district where he was residing. This license would, of course, not be granted if the job he was seeking was wanted by any Japanese laborer. These things I am stating on the authority of a distinguished Japanese lawyer who delivered an address recently before the American Bar Association at Saratoga, N. Y. I am also advised by those who have lived in Japan and speak from experience that Americans in Japan are obliged to pay double the taxes that are assessed against natives. If they wish to attend the theater and the price of a ticket to a native

would be 60 sen, the American will be forced to pay 200 sen, and in other things it is the same. Besides these things, the ways in which the Japanese undertake to drive out of Japan any American who embarks in business there are most exasperating.

I have here a letter from a gentleman now living in New York which shows more in detail how this is done. He writes as follows:

NOS. 140 AND 142 PEARL STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y.,
December 13, 1906.

Hon. E. A. HAYES,
Member of Congress Fifth Congressional District of California,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 8th duly reached me, and before replying I wished to secure, as requested, the name of an authority on Japanese laws and their bearing on foreigners under the treaties. The following, "A digest written for the international committee of Yokohama," by Dr. L. Lonholm, will give you particulars:

The treaty may read nice to people on this side who have never been to Japan and have never traded with the Japanese, but there are so many differences between what the United States allows a Japanese when here and what the Japanese Government allows an American in Japan it makes one disgusted and anxious to quit doing anything or having anything to do with Japan or the Japanese.

There is a law in Japan forbidding the transfer of land to foreigners, and under the new treaties foreigners are not entitled to own land. Foreigners can own buildings. The land on which such buildings stand may be held by the foreigners under either a lease or a superficies. Americans can not practice law in Japan or become a printer, editor, or publisher of a newspaper. Americans can not engage in mining in Japan.

While the treaty apparently gives an American the same rights as a Japanese, you will note that the Japanese were shrewd enough not to mention in the treaty that they had already passed imperative laws which no treaty could abrogate unless mentioned in the treaty.

My idea is that this time the Japs know they have made a mistake, as they never dreamed of a refusal, and supposed by making a big noise California would at once apologize and open its schools. Japan never expected the final turn down and the subsequent events, knowing full well that an investigation of the treaty will expose the one-sided affair it is.

Some years ago the Japanese Government began paying a subsidy to the Japanese Tea Guild, the object being to drive out the American tea men. The subsidy was paid under the name of a sum to be used to advertise the good qualities of Japan teas and thus add to their consumption. This was unnecessary, as the United States and Canada bought and consumed all the leaf Japan could sell for export. Shortly after the Japanese Government began paying the money Japanese began opening up tea offices in New York, Chicago, and other points, and native tea-firing plants began to operate in the interior tea-growing points of Japan. It then developed that the rents and expenses of the different tea offices in the United States were being paid out of the money paid by the Japanese Government; also that the native tea-firing hongs were being paid 50 yen for every firing pan they put up. It was even bragged of by the Japs in New York that they would soon drive the Americans out of the trade, as they were being backed by their Government.

The writer brought the whole matter up with the State Department, and the Japanese Government agreed to cease paying the subsidy, but, as usual, lied and paid it. On again bringing the matter up the Japanese evidently told the State Department to mind its own business; at least, from the letter I received from the State Department, I inferred as much and ceased trying to get protection. My contention was that the Japanese bounty was an export bounty and that teas on which that bounty was paid should, according to the Dingley tariff, pay an import duty equal to the export duty.

I will be pleased at any time to give you any further particulars, and trust you will never allow a Jap in your public schools, although I believe most of the States in the East, from ignorance of the Jap, would make no objection.

Yours, very truly,

It seems to one of the most humble members of this coordinate branch of the Government that our most distinguished Secretary of State could not be better employed than in striving to secure for American citizens in Japan those rights guaranteed to them by the treaty, but which they are nevertheless denied.

Mr. Chairman, the people of California have one of the fairest spots on all the earth. It is their home, and they love it. They are Americans, and they are here asking Americans to so legislate as to protect them from an insidious conquest of orientals, which, unless prevented by law, will overwhelm them, destroying or rendering wholly uncongenial the homes which they fondly hope to hand down to their children with all the holy influences around them that now pervade the American home. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to call to the attention of this committee two bills which I have introduced to wit, H. R. 14609 and H. R. 14610. The former has been referred to the Committee on War Claims and the latter to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

I am urging the passage of H. R. 14609 because of the fact that adequate recognition has never been given to the sufferings and hardships of all Union prisoners of war by the Government of the United States. Large sums of money have been appropriated for the purpose of pensioning the men who fought in the Union armies for periods of ninety days to three years or more. The pension rolls carry probably all of those still surviving who went through the horrors of Confederate military

prisons, yet for these experiences, which more than outweigh any others of the dangers of hardships of war, the Federal Government has never seen fit to set apart a sum of money as compensation. The pensions under the general laws in no way compensate these men for their sufferings. In the first place, men who contracted disabilities that have burdened their lives from the day of their release from such places as Andersonville and Libby have great difficulty and oftentimes are unable to prove the incurrence of these disabilities in the service in the line of duty, and secondly, their meager pensions do not begin to repay them for the sufferings endured and for the physical anguish and loss of vigor that more or less affected their career in after years. It is because of these reasons that I have introduced the bill above referred to, which provides that all Federal soldiers who were honorably discharged and who were confined in Confederate prisons shall be paid in the sum of \$2 for each day of confinement therein. Provision is also made for the widow of the soldier if she be not remarried, and she is entitled under the provisions of this bill to receive the same sum as would have been paid to the husband because of said imprisonment.

Practically every association of ex-prisoners of war throughout the United States has recommended the enactment of such a law. Since I have introduced this bill letters have reached me from broken-down soldiers—residents of every part of the United States—who urgently plead that something be done in the way of recognition for the sufferings which they endured.

Coming down to the practical side of the question, it may be asked how great a sum would be diverted every year from the Treasury of the United States should this bill become a law. This is a very difficult question to answer, and it is, perhaps, impossible to give any definite or reliable figures. This is because of the fact that the records of the Confederate military prisons were fragmentary and often, at best, unreliable. Therefore it is a matter of considerable speculation as to the number of men who were actually confined in Confederate prisons, and especially as to the number of men who survived incarceration. I have made every effort to obtain reliable information in this direction. Gen. F. C. Ainsworth, in a letter to me under date of April 9, 1906, in answer to a request for this information, states as follows:

According to the best information now obtainable, it appears that 211,411 Union soldiers were captured during the civil war, of which number 16,668 were paroled on the field, and that consequently 194,743 were held in captivity. It also appears that 30,218 Union soldiers died while in captivity; but the records of Confederate prisons in the possession of the War Department are by no means complete, and the number of deaths of Union prisoners of war is doubtless much greater than the number herein stated. * * * The total number of deaths in Confederate prisons will never be definitely known.

Other authorities do not give as large a number of prisoners in the Confederate prisons. In the statistical record of the armies of the United States prepared by Frederick Pfeister, late a captain in the United States Army, it is estimated that the missing and captured on the Union side totaled 184,791. In other words, he says that one out of every fifteen had been captured or reported missing. As showing the discrepancy between figures and estimates of the number of Union men confined in southern prisons, the following figures, taken from the work entitled "Prisoners of War and Military Prisons," by Asa B. Isham, are submitted. He states that the captured white troops numbered 86 in every 1,000 men. From these varied reports it is safe to say that probably not more than 100,000 men of the Union forces lived through their prison experience and were returned to the Union Army. In the forty years or more that have elapsed since the close of the war it is more than probable to suppose that at least half of this number have died. It seems more reasonable to accept the statement of Mr. Isham in the work above referred to, after making allowances for the discrepancies between the records of the Confederate military prisons and the actual facts. The steps in his recapitulation at the end of his very excellent argument show that the total number of men captured by the rebels amounted to 188,145; the number paroled, estimated at one-half, amounted to 94,072; the number actually confined in prison, 94,072; the number of deaths in Confederate prisons, 36,401; per cent of mortality in rebel prisons, 38.7 per cent. On the basis of these figures, but 57,671 Union soldiers left the rebel prisons alive. It is no extravagant estimate to state that perhaps 50 per cent of this number have died since the war. Thus not more than 20,000 soldiers and soldiers' widows would reap the benefit sought to be conferred by this bill.

There can be no doubt that the men who endured the agonies of prison life or tortures of confinement in the prison pens when partisanship ran high deserve the small bounty which this bill provides. The Government has proven its generosity in the case of men who served but three months during the last call of the

war. It has never recognized the supreme sacrifices of its prisoners of war, and it seems but fitting and proper that the policy of liberality which has come to prevail in pension matters should be put in force before it is too late to benefit the survivors of the awful days of confinement and distress in Confederate military prisons.

In introducing H. R. 14610, which is referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, I did so in answer to a general demand that a more fair, just, and equitable law be passed granting relief to the widows of the veterans of the civil war. Over forty years have passed since the war was terminated. We have had another war since that time, and had, approximately, on June 30, 1906, on the pension rolls some 22,621 pensioners as the result of this last struggle. From time to time Congress has enacted laws that have sought to increase the sums paid to those who survived in that great conflict from 1861 to 1865, to their widows, and to the dependent children. The sentiment seems to be general that there should be a more liberal general pension law, since statistics show that because of death, remarriage, legal limitation, failure to claim, and other causes, approximately 47,000 pensioners are dropped from the rolls each year. In 1905, to be explicit, the number dropped was 47,444, of which number 25,208 were civil-war survivors.

That there is a sentiment for more liberal pension legislation is evidenced by the willingness of Congress to enact special pension legislation to relieve those unfortunate claimants who are unable, for various reasons, to obtain proper relief from the Bureau of Pensions. The special bill is not satisfactory. It helps a few, but it does not relieve the conditions affecting the great body of men and women whose claim upon the Government is based upon patriotic services during the days of national peril. General laws should be passed making unnecessary the enactment of special legislation, by rendering fair and equal justice to all claimants under the pension laws. No better example of inequitable legislation can be found than the present act of June 27, 1890. As a step in the direction of liberality and fairness, I have introduced the bill before mentioned, which proposes to amend what is commonly known as the "act of June 27, 1890." The original act provides that the widow of a soldier who was married before the 27th of June, 1890, and whose income does not exceed \$250 in any one year, may, upon proof of this marriage, without proving the husband's death from service causes, receive \$8 per month. I seek to amend this act by amending the date of marriage so as to bring it forward ten years, to the 27th day of June, 1900, and increasing the pension allowed to \$12 per month. In the bill as introduced I have raised the income limit from \$250 to \$350 per year, but I will say at this time that after careful investigation I find this income clause the most common reason for rejection, and considering the increased cost of living, I will, when the bill is considered by the committee to which it has been referred, urge that this income clause be stricken out altogether.

It must be admitted that in these days of advanced cost of living an income of even \$350 will not suffice to keep an aged widow in even moderately comfortable circumstances. This is more particularly true owing to the methods pursued by the Pension Department in estimating the income. Oftentimes a soldier dies, leaving to his widow a small house and practically no money with which to maintain it. Yet, in estimating her income, the rental value of that house is charged against her, and in frequent cases coming under my observation this amounts to at least one-half of the income limit now provided by law, leaving to the widow but \$125 a year for her actual living expenses, clothing, and other incidentals. I therefore propose that the income clause be stricken out entirely, and in support of this contention I wish at this point to incorporate in my remarks the following figures and comparisons for the consideration of the committee:

During the past year ending January 1, 1907, there were rejected, from all causes, 3,759 widow applicants for pension. I am informed by the Pension Department that not more than one-third of this number could be credited to the income-limitation clause of the act of June 27, 1890, since remarriage, failure to claim, proof of the existence of the husband for whom pension is claimed, or the hundred other circumstances which are turned up by the Pension Department every week are the reasons for rejections of the claims. It seems fair, therefore, to take either one-third or one-fourth of 3,759 as the number that would be added during any one year by the removal of the income limitation. On the basis of one-third there would be 1,253 widows who would be pensioned at \$8 per month or \$96 per year, or a total of \$120,288. On the basis of one-fourth, or 940 additional pensioners at \$96 per year, the addition to the pension roll would be \$90,240. On the basis of ten years, supposing 2,000 of the claimants would die within the decade—a

very reasonable presumption—the addition because of this amendment would amount to \$710,400. This might perhaps seem a big sum; but when it is considered that over 47,000 are being dropped every year from the rolls, and that this proportion will rapidly increase every year, the amendment is not drastic or in any sense unreasonable.

On January 31, 1905, there were borne on the rolls of the Pension Department 1,004,196 pensioners, and on June 30, 1906, there appeared the names of 985,971 pensioners. In eighteen months, therefore, there was a net decrease of 18,225 pensioners. The average amount of each pension, according to the Commissioner of Pensions, is \$138.18. On June 30, 1905, there were 998,441 pensioners on the roll, and on June 30, 1906, 985,971, a net decrease of 12,472. On the basis of the decrease in the roll of pensioners for the year ended June 30, 1906, at the average amount of each pension for the year, \$138.18, the amount of decrease would be \$1,723,380.96. If the property limitation was stricken out, therefore, the decrease in expenditure for one year would largely exceed the pensions of all additions to the roll of widow applicants on the basis previously indicated.

On June 30, 1906, there were 175,237 widows pensioned under the act of June 27, 1890, and 76,810 under the general law, making a total of 252,047 widows drawing pensions. On June 30, 1905, there were 169,066 widows drawing under the act of June 27, 1890, and 77,620 drawing under the general law, or a total of 246,686. There was thus a net increase of 5,361 June 30, 1906, as compared with June 30, 1905, a gain of 6,171 under the act of June 27, 1890, and a loss of 810 under the general law. Looking at the other side of the proposition, there were on June 30, 1906, 461,078 invalids pensioned under the act of June 27, 1890, and 205,375 under the general law, making a total of 666,453. The total for June 30, 1905, of pensioners under the act of June 27, 1890, and the general law is 684,608. There would be a reduction, therefore, from 1905 to 1906 of 18,155 men pensioners. On June 30, 1906, there were 205,375 men drawing pensions under the general law, while on June 30, 1905, there were 219,384 drawing under the general law. In this one year, therefore, there were dropped from the rolls 14,009 pensioners under the general law. The great majority of this number probably died, since, as cited above, 6,171 widows were added under the act of June 27, 1890, and none under the general law—in fact, there was a reduction under the general law. This is conclusive proof that but one woman was added for every three men whose pensions were dropped. Further, pensions under the general law provide a much larger distribution of money than the widows' pensions, which at most reach but \$12 per month.

The number of pensioners reached high-water mark January 31, 1905. The total was 1,004,196. There will be a rapid decrease in the ensuing ten years, as is indicated by the large decrease in the past fiscal year. The tide is rapidly ebbing and many thousands will be dropped in the next decade. It will be seen from the statistics given that the proposed amendment will not add anything to the appropriation, but will simply take up a part of that which will be saved each year because of the death of the veterans of the civil war.

The second provision of this amendment provided that the widows who were married prior to June 27, 1900, shall become eligible for pensions. I know of no means by which statistics could be obtained showing the exact number who would be benefited by thus putting forward the time from marriage from 1890 to 1900, but I do not believe that this addition would be considerable, and if it was, I still insist that in justice and equity the woman who has married and lived with a soldier since shortly after June, 1890, up to the present time and who has devoted sixteen years of her life as a faithful wife should not be barred by an arbitrary time limitation. I have heard it claimed that the original date was fixed to bar adventuresses from marrying old soldiers in order to procure this pittance. This is an insult to American womanhood, and if for no other reason than to express our confidence in the purity and honor of the women of this country, who are sought in marriage by the soldiers of the civil war, this date should be brought forward to the time designated in the amendment. It could by no possibility attract adventuresses, since those who married after June 27, 1890, did so with the full understanding that they were barred from drawing a pension. Sixteen years have passed since that date, and most of the marriages contracted in this period have not been between veterans and young women, but rather between veterans and women of middle age. It would seem that some provision should be made for caring for the widows who gave their services late in life to ministering to the broken and suffering veterans of the war. The addition would be inconsiderable, and the good accomplished would far outweigh any money consideration.

I would urge that the committee consider this proposed legislation carefully. With our wonderful national wealth, with a great surplus piling up in the Treasury of the United States, there can be no more auspicious time to lighten to some extent the burdens that oppress the widows of the soldiers of the civil war. This amendment to the act of June 27, 1890, would work inestimable good and place upon the roll many deserving women. From the figures which I have submitted with my remarks, it can be readily shown that the amount such legislation would withdraw from the National Treasury would not be of any consequence. In fact, I am sure that it would not in any way increase the appropriation, or even reach the appropriation for pensions made in 1904 and other preceding years. Because I believe this proposed legislation is just, because I believe that we owe to the widow of the soldier some equitable and just recognition for her services in the home, I will urge a favorable report of this bill. There is no better way of showing honor and respect to and earning the gratitude of patriotic American womanhood. [Loud applause.]

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, on divers occasions during my brief Congressional career I attempted to have remedial and effective legislation enacted for the benefit of certain classes of survivors of the civil and Spanish-American wars. I recognize that other Members of this House have had the same designs and purposes in mind, but hitherto our efforts have been fruitless in that direction.

Our appeals on certain phases of this class of legislation were listened to by a deaf ear in the past. During the first session of this Congress I introduced a bill providing that all soldiers and sailors who served ninety days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the late war of the rebellion and the Spanish-American war, who had been honorably discharged, and who were or might hereafter be suffering from the loss of sight of both eyes and had become totally blind from causes not resulting while in the service of the United States and not the result of vicious or intemperate habits, be placed upon the list of pensioners of the United States, and that they be granted a pension of \$30 per month.

At this session I introduced a bill (H. R. 21378) on the same subject, broader and more extensive, providing that all soldiers and sailors who served ninety days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the late war of the rebellion or the Spanish-American war, who have been honorably discharged, and who are or may hereafter be suffering from the loss of sight of both eyes, and that all soldiers and sailors who are or may become bedridden, who are or may become utterly helpless, who are or may become paralytics, and who are or may become painfully or permanently disabled from causes not occurring whilst in the service of the United States, upon making due proof of the fact of the said several disabilities, be placed upon the pension list of the United States and be granted a pension of \$30 per month. In fairness to all sufferers from such disabilities such legislation should be enacted.

Congress has established the precedent of granting in numerous and frequent instances \$30 per month, by special bill, to survivors of the civil war who were blind when such a disability was not the result of military or naval service. Congress has also established the precedent of granting by special bill \$24 to \$30 per month to survivors of the civil war who were bedridden, utterly helpless, paralytics, and who had become painfully and permanently disabled, where such disabilities were not the result of service origin.

There are many surviving soldiers in the United States who are suffering from the disabilities enumerated in said bill or bills introduced. Without a special bill, survivors of the civil war or the Spanish-American war suffering from disabilities enumerated in the bills introduced can not secure more than the maximum sum of \$12 per month. This latter allowance is granted to them by and through the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 27, 1890.

Why should not all honorably discharged soldiers, who were in the service ninety days and upward, and who are blind, bedridden, utterly helpless, paralytic, and painfully and permanently disabled, and thereby unable to perform mental or manual labor, have like benefits and equal rewards? Why should A, blind, receive a pension of \$30 per month, and B, his next neighbor, similarly afflicted and disabled, be limited to his allowance or gratuity granted him by the provisions of the act of Congress above referred to? Why should C, honorably discharged, and in the service more than ninety days, bedridden, or utterly helpless, or a paralytic, painfully and permanently disabled, not the result of his military service and not the result of vicious or intemperate habits, be the beneficiary of the liberality of Congress to the extent of twenty-four or thirty

dollars per month, and his neighbor, D, similarly afflicted, be limited to \$12 per month? These and such inequalities do exist and should be corrected and remedied by proper and adequate legislation.

Why has Congress been so tardy and hesitated so long on this subject? True, Congress has been liberal in many respects, and has rewarded the great majority of our old soldiers, but it has also compelled many, afflicted as above described, to patiently wait until their remains were deposited in the tomb or to the last of their declining days.

The storm of life is rapidly thinning and decimating the ranks of the survivors. Another decade and all the survivors of the civil war will be beyond the septuagenarian period of life. I am not complaining of the liberality or the nonliberality of Congress on this subject in the past, but I complain that those possessing the same class and form of disability are not uniformly rewarded for their services and consequent suffering.

The Invalid Pension Committee of the House and the Senate and their clerks are overworked, and are doing the best and most they can to grant relief during the period that Congress is in session. Every Member of Congress introduces special bills for original and increase of pensions. Many a Member introduces thirty and forty bills for original and increase of pension and relief during a session when he is well advised that not more than one-fourth or one-fifth of his bills can and will be considered by the committee.

All the cases may be equally meritorious. There are 386 Members in this body. The committee is endeavoring to be fair and just, and that each Member shall, as near as possible, have an equal number of special pension bills considered at each session or term of Congress. Take it for granted that each Member at each session secures favorable consideration of half a dozen special pension bills, the aggregate number acted upon would exceed 2,300 cases, and such a number of bills would tax the time and ability of the most efficient committee and most competent clerks during a session of average length and duration.

I introduced at the first session of this Congress thirty-seven pension bills—all meritorious, in my judgment—under the precedent established and followed, and but nine were favorably acted upon. Those not considered must wait the opportunity at a subsequent session, or the order in which I or my successor may choose to have the same considered by the committee.

I predict that by the time all the bills introduced by me during the last session and previous sessions of Congress can and will be considered by the committee, under the established rules and existing practice, one-half of those asking for relief by special bill will have passed into eternity. And the experience of a majority of the Members of this body is identical with my own experience.

The passage of a bill or bills such as I have introduced will increase the pensions paid but a trifling sum as compared with the aggregate of pension appropriations heretofore provided for. Usually those most advanced in years, most feeble, and seriously and painfully disabled are selected to be rewarded by special legislation. Their days are numbered, and generally they do not long survive the period when they are allowed an increase. Many of those whom I endeavored to favor did not survive a year to enjoy such blessings and benefits.

In the second session of the Fifty-eighth Congress the committee and this House favorably considered only three of the special bills introduced by me, and I regret to say that all three died in less than a year after their pecuniary reward for services granted by Congress was announced, and I have been informed that one of the beneficiaries under bills introduced by me in the first session of the Fifty-ninth Congress departed within six months after his bill was signed by the President; and such, as I stated before, is the experience of every Member in this House who was required to ask for special legislation on this subject.

The committee will act favorably on every bill that can be reached for consideration wherein it is established that the soldier is blind, bedridden, utterly helpless, a paralytic, and painfully or permanently disabled, and where it is further established that his disabilities are not the result of vicious and intemperate habits, and he is unable to perform mental or manual labor to support and maintain himself, and was in the service for a period of ninety days and upward.

There are many survivors of this class of soldiers who are equally and similarly disabled who have not received and never will receive the benefits of increase of pension by special legislation. And why is this so? It is because their cases can not be reached and considered under present practices and existing legislation. Very few citizens make complaint or refuse to pay their taxes and bear their burdens provided they are equal

and uniform. The benefits provided for by pension legislation should likewise be equal and uniform amongst the several classes of beneficiaries enumerated in the bill introduced. If this kind of legislation is wrong in principle, then stop the procedure and wipe out the precedent, and revoke and repeal what has been enacted on the subject.

But since it is approved by legislation and the people of this country, and the precedent is established, permit all who may be embraced and enumerated in this class of patriotic and unfortunate citizens to enjoy the benefits and privileges and rewards of equality and uniformity in our pension laws. Special legislation becomes necessary sometimes to provide for special cases which the generality of general laws will not cover and can not reach. But special legislation on the subject referred to in said bill can not reach all classes and men equally and uniformly by reason of want of time and limitation upon the number of bills that can be considered. The subjects embraced in said bill can, without injustice, inequality, or inconvenience, be included in a general bill and in a general class.

If you pass the legislation referred to, the duties of the Invalid Pension Committee will be lessened and simplified, and all blind men and those who are bedridden, utterly helpless, paralytics, and painfully or permanently disabled, and whose disabilities are not the result of service origin and vicious or intemperate habits, who are honorably discharged, and were in the military or naval service of the United States for ninety days and upward, will be equally, similarly, and uniformly rewarded, as they should be, without exception, omission, favor, or preference.

Liberality and justice to this class of pensioners, enumerated and contemplated in the bill proposed and heretofore referred to; will not embarrass the public treasury. The country is rich and prosperous, and with legislation advocated and in all probability to be enacted on the proposition of a progressive tax on inheritances and incomes, by which large revenues will be collected without inconvenience or discomfort to anyone, the passage of such a general pension bill will add but a trifling additional burden upon the Government during the declining years of the men who may become included within its provisions. The men who will be included in this class of beneficiaries have aided in making this country prosperous and rich, great and united. These questions are not new. Every Congress possibly since the Mexican war heard this discussion in some phase or other.

Little, if anything, can be uttered in behalf of pensions that has not already been said or discussed. Nearly all civilized nations make provision for the pensioning of their surviving soldiery and family or families dependent upon them. It is patriotic, reasonable, and proper that it should be so.

Those who leave their homes, property, and business during the days of war and conflict are justly rewarded by proper and reasonable pensions for their patriotic valor, sacrifice, and risk to which they subjected themselves and loss they may or have sustained to business and property; and this class of men and those in family relations dependent upon them should be rewarded as an incentive to this and future generations to perform military service in the event of conflict with foreign nations or internal strife and dissensions requiring military aid.

For the reasons hereinbefore indicated I urge that the Invalid Pensions Committee favorably report, and that this House without delay enact the bill introduced, as a portion of our pension legislation.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] so much time as he desires.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill carries an appropriation of over \$138,000,000 for the payment of pensions to the veteran soldiers and sailors of the country, and it affords a very appropriate occasion to offer some remarks upon our general pension laws.

While the pension policy of the country is very liberal toward those who have made sacrifices for the preservation of our institutions, it is, perhaps, the best safeguard the Government can adopt. If this country should ever be involved in another great war, particularly engaging the land forces, it must depend chiefly upon a volunteer army, and the record it makes in its treatment of those who volunteered in the past to defend our institutions against destruction and overthrow will go far toward inspiring faith and securing volunteers for the purposes of defense in the future. The Government pays more in the way of pensions than all the other countries of the earth combined, and yet it does not pay a dollar that is not justly due to its veteran defenders, and, as a matter of public safety, every dollar of that money is well invested. I would infinitely rather have a large and liberal pension roll than to have the Government annually appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars for

the maintenance of a large standing army during times of peace. Our large pension roll enables us to do with a comparatively small standing army.

While the pension policy is liberal and its spirit is just, in the administration of the laws, in order to prevent imposition, the Pension Bureau has established many rules respecting proof of claims that appear somewhat technical, and it is now impossible for many veterans of the civil war to furnish the evidence of the origin of their disabilities that the rules of the Pension Bureau require. In order to meet this situation and provide relief for a vast number of veterans who were unable to make proof of the origin of their disabilities the law of 1890 was passed providing that all persons who served ninety days and over in the civil war and were honorably discharged, on proof of disability without reference to its origin, should receive pensions ranging from \$6 to \$12 a month. The veterans of that war are all now in advanced years. Many of them are totally disabled for the performance of manual labor and are unable to furnish the proof required to connect their disabilities with their Army service. Thousands are destitute and are compelled to subsist upon the small allowance of \$12 a month provided under the law of 1890. Numerous veterans of this class have wives to support, and it is a sad spectacle to see a brave and worthy veteran who served his country three or four years honorably and valiantly and whose system may have been poisoned with the germs of disease, now in his declining years, in destitute circumstances, unable to earn anything to support himself, and who is compelled to care for himself and his aged wife upon a pittance of \$12 a month.

As a result of this condition many thousands have applied to Congress for relief in the way of private legislation. During the present Congress there have been introduced in both Houses private pension bills to the number of 19,300. About 3,500 House bills have been enacted into law and 1,750 Senate bills, making a total of upward of 5,200, and leaving undisposed of about 14,000 bills. Of these 14,000 bills the bulk of them are for the relief of worthy men; men who are in destitute circumstances; men who are unable to perform any kind of manual labor, or to earn anything to relieve their wants and the wants of their families; men who have no income excepting, probably, a pension of \$12 a month under the law of 1890. A large majority of these applicants firmly believe that their present disabled condition is chiefly the result of their military service, and that fact seems morally probable, yet they can not make the technical proof required by the Pension Bureau. They may have no hospital record; they may be unable to prove actual acute sickness while in the service by two comrades or commissioned officers, and, therefore, they can not avail themselves of the liberality of the general law. Their witnesses may be dead or may have forgotten the facts.

In the House there are two committees engaged most of the time in the examination of private pension bills. Under the rules of the House no bill can be considered upon the floor until it has been referred to the proper committee, investigated, and reported back for action. There have been such an avalanche of private bills during the last few Congresses that the Pension Committees, devoting most of their time to that work, have been utterly unable to investigate the merits of near all of them, and the result has been that only about one-fourth of those that were introduced have been examined and reported upon. The remaining three-fourths—many of them just as meritorious and just as worthy as those that are investigated and acted upon—rest with the committee and expire with the Congress in which they were introduced. The Pensions Committees are composed of able and industrious men, and the work they have done in the investigation of this class of bills has put the Congress and the country under many obligations to them; but under the very best system of examination and consideration possible the private pension policy is largely and necessarily a policy of favoritism, granting that all of the private bills introduced are substantially of the same merit. Five thousand of them are successful and nearly 15,000 are unsuccessful. Some are fortunate and some are unfortunate. Many of the unfortunate ones have as great claims upon the consideration of Congress and upon the gratitude of the country as the fortunate ones.

This policy is so manifestly unjust and unfair that in my opinion there is an imperative need of some general and efficient legislation that will tend to equalize conditions and to put veterans of the civil war as far as possible upon an equal footing. I have done the best I could to secure the consideration of all the private pension bills that I have introduced. I have succeeded in procuring the passage of my full quota in every session of Congress since I have been a Member of this body, but I have felt at the close of each session that many worthy appli-

cants who had the right to expect favorable consideration of their bills would necessarily be disappointed because of the lack of time and opportunity to give consideration to their claims.

The Senate passed a bill a few days ago, known as the "McCumber bill," based chiefly upon the fact of service. It provides that all Union veterans of the civil war who served ninety days and over and were honorably discharged shall, upon arriving at the age of 62 years, be granted a pension at the rate of \$12 a month, and upon reaching the age of 70 years the pension shall be increased to \$15 a month, and on reaching the age of 75 years the pension shall be further increased to \$20 a month, the maximum provided in that bill.

That bill would doubtless afford some relief to a great many people, but it will not meet the requirements of the situation. It is based upon service arbitrarily, and not upon disability. Most all of the applicants for private pensions are men who served faithfully—many during the entire war. They are now destitute of means of support and are so disabled that they can not perform manual labor, and perhaps the majority of them are under 70 years of age. They are drawing now only \$12 a month under the law of 1890. The McCumber bill will afford no relief to this class of veterans who are under 70 years of age. The applications for private pensions will continue to be about as great in the future as they have been in the past.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman permit me to state, as I understand, the McCumber bill also includes the Mexican war veterans?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes; the bill includes Mexican war veterans who now are allowed pensions on a service basis at the rate of \$12 a month. The McCumber bill would give them the maximum of \$20 a month, because they are all over 75 years of age. I like that feature of the bill.

Mr. GARRETT. It would be a help to the Mexican war veterans.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes; very materially.

I introduced a bill in the House a few days ago providing for an increase of the maximum pension rate fixed by the law of 1890. The bill provides that the maximum under that law shall be \$24 a month instead of \$12, as it now is. If that bill were enacted into law, it would relieve almost all of those who now come to Congress for relief in the way of private legislation. Perhaps a majority of the private bills that are reported increasing pensions fix the rate at \$24 a month. If all those who are totally disabled and are receiving \$12 a month under the law of 1890 were given \$24 a month, there would not be one-tenth as many applications for private pensions as there are now. All the soldiers who are in the same physical condition would be placed upon an equal footing and Congress would be able to investigate and act upon all the private bills that might be introduced.

Mr. BURTON of Delaware. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not think also that his proposed amendment to the law would work more equitably in getting pensions on the merits of the case rather than by favoritism?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It would be infinitely better and more equitable than the present private-pension system. The favoritism under the existing practice is not political or religious, and is in no degree the fault of the Committees on Pensions and Invalid Pensions. It is the fault of the law and the system that has grown up under it.

Mr. OTJEN. The gentleman's proposed amendment to the law would raise all those who are now receiving \$12 to \$24?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is the proposition exactly.

Mr. CROMER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will.

Mr. CROMER. What provision does the gentleman make for the widows? Does he double their pensions?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not make any provision at all. I would like to do so, but I think it is wisdom to take up one branch of the subject at a time. I am in favor of increasing the pensions of all widows of soldiers of the civil war, all pensionable widows, to \$12 a month. I think \$12 a month ought to be the minimum pension for widows.

The Committee on Invalid Pensions of the House has a rule providing that no bill for the increase of a private pension will be considered unless the applicant has been able to establish his right to the maximum pension under the law of 1890 before the Commissioner of Pensions. I desire to impress upon the House the importance of enacting a general law increasing the maximum rate under the law of 1890 to \$24 a month and to emphasize the fact that it would relieve Congress of the duty

of investigating such an avalanche of private bills. I doubt if there would be a thousand bills for private pensions introduced during an entire Congress under the operation of a law of that kind, and it would bring happiness and comfort to the homes of many thousand veterans in all parts of the United States.

But we are told that it would involve the expenditure of a large additional sum of public money, and it probably would. I have not taken the pains to ascertain how much it would increase the annual appropriation. It would probably increase it fifteen or twenty millions a year; but what if it did? That would only amount to the cost of two modern battle ships. While we are appropriating in the neighborhood of \$800,000,000 at every session of Congress to conduct the Government and to carry on various public activities, an increase in the appropriations of fifteen or twenty million dollars as an act of justice to the defenders of the country would not only be justified but applauded by a large majority of the American people. Pensions are granted not as a matter of charity or gratuity, but as a matter of right. When the civil war was on, when the Government was seeking recruits for the upbuilding of its Army, men were given to understand that if they would enlist and assist in preventing the destruction of the Government they should never come to want; that the Government would provide for their widows and children in the event they lost their lives in defense of the flag, and would provide adequate pensions to care for them if they were disabled; so the enactment of laws providing for adequate pensions to care for the destitute and disabled survivors of the Army of the Union is simply a discharge of an obligation founded in justice and gratitude.

Besides, money paid out and expended under a law of that kind would be distributed equitably in all sections of the country. It would go into the hands of the poor, as a rule, who would use it for the necessities of life, and it would go into immediate circulation, and the business of the country would not be affected by the appropriation in the least. I am earnestly in favor of that kind of a law. I will vote for the McCumber bill, if I can not secure the adoption of a more just and generous pension law. The McCumber bill will afford a great deal of relief, but it will not afford adequate relief. The time has come when the country should feel its obligation to adopt such a pension policy as will result in as near justice as possible to all of its veteran soldiers. No pension law can operate with exact justice to all, but it is infinitely better to be more than just to some than to be unjust to many.

The veterans of the civil war are fast passing from the scene of action. They are going to their final reward at such a rate that in a short time but few will remain as reminders of the bloody struggle that was necessary to perpetuate the Union. The declining years of these men ought to be made as comfortable and happy as possible. They should be permitted to enjoy the comforts and blessings of the Government their sacrifices made permanent. I have no sympathy with the criticism of pension laws that is based upon the increase of expenditures. I would rather forego the construction of a battle ship occasionally. I would rather economize in expenditures in other lines than to require the veteran soldiers of the Republic in their declining years to barely eke out an existence on a pittance of eight or ten or twelve dollars a month.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I do not see the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN] here. If there is no other gentleman who wishes to occupy time this evening I move that the committee do now rise. I see the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is here. Does the gentleman wish to occupy any time to-day?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Not to-day.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Then I renew my motion that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNSEND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 24640, the pension appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

SERVICE PENSION LEGISLATION.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Invalid Pensions and the Committee on Pensions be, and hereby are, authorized to sit as a joint committee for the purpose of considering Senate bill No. 976, an act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the civil war and the war with Mexico; and that such joint committee have leave to sit during the sessions of the House.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Reserving the right to object, I would like the gentleman to explain the object of that resolution.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, the reason for the meeting of the joint committee is that the McCumber bill carries in it provisions for civil-war veterans and also for Mexican-war veterans, and, under the rules of the House, the Committee on Invalid Pensions have charge of all pension matters relating to service and disability from service in the civil war, while the Committee on Pensions have matters pertaining to the service and disability from service in all other wars; so that it has been deemed better and wiser that both committees sit as a joint committee, so that whatever action they take in regard to this matter may be written in one bill, without any future legislation in any other line.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection. The Chair would suggest to the gentleman from New Jersey that he amend the resolution so that they may sit as one committee instead of as a joint committee.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. I accept the suggestion of the Chair, and ask to strike out the word "joint" where it first occurs and insert the word "one," and strike out the word "joint" where it occurs the second time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. In this case how would you sign up a report?

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. The whole committee can select who shall make the report, the same as we do in other committees. I move the adoption of the resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

STURGEON BAY, ILLINOIS.

Mr. GRAFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 207.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 207) declaring Sturgeon Bay, Illinois, not navigable water.

Resolved, etc., That so much of the west fork of Sturgeon Bay within the county of Mercer and State of Illinois as lies west of the line between the east half and the west half of the east half of section 25, in township 14 north, range 6 west of the fourth principal meridian, and so much of the east fork of said Sturgeon Bay as lies north of the north line of section 30, in township 14 north, range 5 west of the fourth principal meridian, shall not be deemed navigable waters of the United States, but dams and bridges may be constructed across the same.

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

In lines 11 and 12 strike out the words "but dams and bridges may be constructed across the same."

Mr. PAYNE. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman to explain the need of this resolution.

Mr. GRAFF. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was made necessary by the fact that a drainage district has been organized under the laws of Illinois for the purpose of reclaiming some 19,000 acres of bottom land at the expense to the owners of the land themselves solely of some \$250,000. It is upon the banks of the Mississippi River, near Boston, and they have to procure the money through the issuance of bonds upon the land, forming a mortgage for their benefit. In order to do this and to make the facts as to the unquestioned unnavigability of a little spur, being, in fact, a slough, it was necessary to pass this bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. What committee reported this legislation?

Mr. GRAFF. It is reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and reported on the recommendation of the War Department. It is stated in the War Department, which examined this survey, that this is some of the water of the Mississippi River, and the so-called "Sturgeon Bay," or slough, was, in fact, unnavigable.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It does not affect the navigability of the stream?

Mr. GRAFF. It does not affect the navigability of the river in any way, because it is too remote from the channel of the river. I have here the report made to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce by General Mackenzie as to the unnavigable character of the river.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The joint resolution as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

MARITIME EXPOSITION AT BORDEAUX, FRANCE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, re-

ferred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and, with accompanying papers, ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of the respective Houses of the Congress a report of the Acting Secretary of State representing the appropriateness of early action in order that the Government of the United States may be enabled to be fittingly represented at the International Maritime Exposition to be held at Bordeaux from May 1 to October 31 of this year to celebrate the centenary of steam navigation inaugurated by the American inventor, Robert Fulton.

The recommendations of this report have my hearty approval, and I hope that the Congress will see fit to make timely provision to enable the Government to respond appropriately to the invitation of the Government of France.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 23, 1907.

AMERICAN SHIPPING.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

[For message see Senate proceedings of this date.]

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 7147. An act to amend section 2536 of the Revised Statutes, relative to assistant appraisers at the port of New York, and further defining their powers, duties, and compensation—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 7793. An act to fix the time of holding the circuit and district courts of the United States in and for the northern district of Iowa—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 7270. An act to establish a fish-hatching and fish-culture station at Dell Rapids, S. Dak.—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. R. 86. Joint resolution granting an extension of time to certain homestead entrymen—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 24048. An act authorizing and empowering the Secretary of War to locate a right of way for and granting the same and a right to operate and maintain a line of railroad through the Fort Wright Military Reservation, in the State of Washington, to the Spokane and Inland Empire Railroad Company, its successors and assigns;

H. R. 3980. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank G. Hammond; and

H. R. 15769. An act granting an increase of pension to William W. Bennett.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 5469. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to investigate and report upon the industrial, social, moral, educational, and physical condition of woman and child workers in the United States;

S. 4423. An act providing for the donation of obsolete cannon, with their carriages and equipments, to the University of Idaho; and

S. 4563. An act to prohibit corporations from making money contributions in connection with political elections.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF PORTO RICO.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President:

The Senate and House of Representatives:

Referring to section 32 of the act approved April 12, 1900, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith an ordinance enacted by the executive council of Porto Rico and approved by the President of the United States.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 23, 1907.

The message, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed. Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a

copy of a letter from the Acting Secretary of State submitting an estimate of appropriation for an increase of the clerical force of the Department—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for an assembly hall for the Government Hospital for the Insane—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for Indian supplies—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Acting Secretary of State submitting an estimate of appropriation for carrying out convention with Mexico as to distribution of the waters of the Rio Grande—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A message from the President of the United States relating to the pending ship-subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for printing and binding in the Department of the Interior—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Arizona, from the Committee on the Territories, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24648) ratifying an act of the Arizona legislature providing for the erection of a court-house at St. Johns, in Apache County, Ariz., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6598); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8969) ratifying and confirming chapter 58 of the twenty-third legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona, providing for repair of the Territorial bridge at Florence, Pinal County, Ariz., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6599); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15518) ratifying chapters 57 and 61 of the session laws of the twenty-third Arizona legislative assembly, providing for the issuance of bonds by Mohave County to erect court-house and jail in said county, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6600); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MONDELL, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23324) authorizing the sale of certain lands to the city of Buffalo, Wyo., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6601); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24285) to provide for holding terms of United States courts at Clarksdale, Miss., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6602); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23394) to provide for an additional district judge for the northern district of California, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6603); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Agriculture: A bill (H. R. 24815) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 24816) to amend an act entitled "An act for the withdrawal from bond, tax

free, of domestic alcohol when rendered unfit for beverage or liquid medicinal uses by mixture with suitable denaturing materials," approved June 7, 1906—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCKMAN: A bill (H. R. 24817) to amend an act entitled "An act permitting the building of a dam across the Mississippi River in the county of Morrison, State of Minnesota," approved June 4, 1906—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24818) to amend an act entitled "An act permitting the building of a dam across the Mississippi River between the counties of Stearns and Sherburne, in the State of Minnesota," approved June 28, 1906—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARNER: A bill (H. R. 24819) supplying a deficiency in the appropriation for the construction of a court-house and custom-house at Laredo, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MCGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 24820) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to accept a building at Perry, Okla., for post-office purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 24821) to authorize the Georgia Southwestern and Gulf Railroad Company to construct a bridge across the Chattahoochee River between the States of Alabama and Georgia—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOUTELL: A bill (H. R. 24822) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish, maintain, and supervise a system of playgrounds in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILEY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 24823) to prevent the exclusion of a newspaper or periodical from the United States mails as second-class matter, after having been entered to such privilege, without due process of law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 24824) authorizing and requiring the President of the United States to negotiate for and make sale of the Philippine Islands to Japan or some other foreign nation at such price as will reimburse the United States for original cost and expenditures incurred in maintaining said islands, on such terms as the President may prescribe—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 24825) authorizing T. L. Glass to bridge Bayou d'Arbonne, in Louisiana—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRELL: A bill (H. R. 24826) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the organization of the militia of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1889—to the Committee on Militia.

By Mr. SIMS: A resolution (H. Res. 785) commending the President of the United States for his action in discharging Companies B, C, and D of the Twenty-fifth United States Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 225) directing the War Department to make investigations and surveys of certain rivers of California—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AMES: A bill (H. R. 24827) granting an increase of pension to Marcus M. Bancroft—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEDE: A bill (H. R. 24828) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURGESS: A bill (H. R. 24829) granting an increase of pension to John R. Robbins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 24830) granting a pension to James M. Ledbetter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 24831) granting an increase of pension to John C. De Witt—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 24832) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Goth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 24833) for the relief of the Louisiana Molasses Company (Limited) and the Louisiana Distilling Company—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 24834) granting a pension to Jesse Craft—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24835) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Neepner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24836) granting an increase of pension to John T. Pinnock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24837) granting an increase of pension to John R. Bungard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FINLEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 24838) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. A. Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 24839) granting a pension to soldiers and sailors of the civil war who are totally blind—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEFLIN: A bill (H. R. 24840) granting a pension to Martha J. Finley—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 24841) to authorize the National Safe Deposit, Savings and Trust Company of the District of Columbia to change its corporate name—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 24842) granting a pension to Obedy Wheeler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 24843) granting an increase of pension to John A. McCarnon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 24844) granting an increase of pension to Robert E. Meeker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGAVIN: A bill (H. R. 24845) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Price—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 24846) granting an increase of pension to Robert M. Wolf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 24847) granting an increase of pension to James A. Carman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24848) granting an increase of pension to Seth D. Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24849) granting an increase of pension to John Breneman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24850) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Jewett—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 24851) granting an increase of pension to O. S. Rouse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 24852) granting an increase of pension to Menzo Eygabroad—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 24853) for the relief of the trustees of the Christian Church in Franklin, Williamson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 24854) for the relief of D. C. Owings—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RHODES: A bill (H. R. 24855) granting a pension to George W. Robins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A bill (H. R. 24856) for the relief of the widow and heirs at law of Patrick J. Fitzgerald, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 24857) for the relief of the estate of Adonis Petit, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24858) for the relief of the estate of Antonio Pfister, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24859) for the relief of the legal representatives of Francisco Deocurro, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 24860) granting an increase of pension to Duncan N. Pritchett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 24861) granting an increase of pension to O. E. D. Culbertson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TRIMBLE: A bill (H. R. 24862) granting an increase of pension to John Brafford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TYNDALL: A bill (H. R. 24863) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Crabtree—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER: A bill (H. R. 24864) granting a pension to William F. Talbott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24865) granting an increase of pension to Soren Julius Thor-Straten—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24866) granting an increase of pension to James H. Thayer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 24867) granting an increase of pension to Stephen B. Doty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 24868) granting a pension to John M. Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEISSE: A bill (H. R. 24869) granting an increase of pension to William Schroeder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILEY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 24870) for the relief of John D. Toppin and George W. Beard, United States Navy, retired—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 24871) for the relief of Mrs. Lillian Engolla—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILSON: A bill (H. R. 24872) granting an increase of pension to James C. Blair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 24873) granting an increase of pension to Jethro German—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 24874) granting an increase of pension to William Arbogast—to the Committee on Pensions.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 24413) granting an increase of pension to William Thomas—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 24611) granting an increase of pension to Volney B. St. John—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of the Pennsylvania State Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. AMES: Petition of the Board of Trade of Lawrence, Mass., for the Wilson bill increasing salaries of postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petitions of citizens of Lake, Ohio; Tallahassee, Fla.; Wheeling, W. Va.; Marshfield, Oreg.; Léroy, La.; Calumet, Mich., and Fort Collins, Colo., against bill S. 5221, regulating the practice of osteopathy in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of citizens of Webster, S. Dak., against bill S. 5221, regulating the practice of osteopathy in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BEDE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Sarah M. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: Paper to accompany bill for relief of heirs of William Wood—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Elizabeth J. Woods—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Christian Lederer—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Mrs. Jennie Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Pennsylvania State Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the National German-American Alliance of the United States, against any change in the present immigration laws—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Benjamin Harvey and Henry J. Simpson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Americus Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John C. De Witt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of Typographical Union No. 162, of Jacksonville, Fla., for the ship-subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Daily and Weekly News, against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Clutter Music House, against the clause in the copyright bill inimical to mechanical musical instruments—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. ELLIS: Petition of the Typothetæ, against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the National German-American Alliance of the United States, against amendment of the existing laws on immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DEEMER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Sargeant Bernhard Steuber—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOVENER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William L. Snider (previously referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions)—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of the National German-American Alliance, against any amendment to the existing immigration laws (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DUNWELL: Petition of Lake Mohawk Conference on International Arbitration, for legislation to devise a plan looking to a recognition of The Hague Conference as a permanent congress of nations with advisory powers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Massachusetts State board of agriculture, for an appropriation to stay the gypsy and brown-tail moths—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York State, for passage of bill H. R. 17347, for artillery increase—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Twenty-sixth Ward Board of Trade, of Brooklyn, N. Y., for bill H. R. 9754 (the Wilson bill), for increase of salaries of postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. FORDNEY: Petition of George A. Needham et al., for the pending bill giving the United States right of appeal on points of law in criminal prosecutions instituted by the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRENCH: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Miller—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Adolph C. Hottenroth et al., for immediate revision of the currency laws—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GILHAMS: Petition of the Journal-Gazette, of Fort Wayne, Ind., against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the National German-American Alliance of the United States, against the immigration bill (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Pennsylvania State Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Petition of Ganges Grange, No. 339, for a parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HARDWICK: Paper to accompany bill for relief of B. C. Gilmore—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of the Nebraska Durac Jersey Breeders' Association, against free seeds—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUNT: Petition of the house of representatives of the State of Missouri, against any further extension of time for building a bridge on what is known as the "Winner piers"—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KEIFER: Petition of William T. Peace and 25 others, late ex-soldiers of the United States Volunteer Army, for restoration of the Army canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of F. W. Anderton and 25 veterans of the civil war, for restoration of the Army canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of C. J. Haximer, against amendment of the existing laws relative to immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of John W. Morris, against section 3 of bill S. 978, relative to pension attorneys—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCALL: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John P. Hart—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McMORRAN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Moore, alias John Rogers (previously referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions)—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McNARY: Petition of the Boston Chamber of Commerce for a plan by which The Hague Conference may be made

a permanent congress of nations—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Boston, for purchasing a Federal forest reserve—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Gettysburg Regiment, No. 19, United Veterans' Union, for restoration of the Army canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Petition of the Nurdyke & Marmon Company, for legislation providing for suitable locked stills for denatured alcohol produced on small scale, without expense of a denaturing bonded warehouse—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PADGETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Christian Church of Franklin, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Nelson M. Buyers—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SAMUEL: Petition of the National German-American Alliance, against any modification of the existing immigration laws—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Marcellus Howser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of the Connecticut State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, against the ship-subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Graduate Nurses' Association of Connecticut, for bill to regulate nursing in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RANDELL of Texas: Petition of citizens of Cannon, Grayson County, Tex., for an appropriation to improve upper Red River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana: Papers to accompany bills for relief of heirs of Leon Bonnacaze, and Addie Pond Gordon, heir of Preston Pond and Addie A. Campbell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REYBURN: Petition of the Pennsylvania State Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Francesco Deocurro, Antoine Pfister, and Mrs. F. T. Landry, administratrix of estate of Adonis Petit—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas: Paper to accompany bill for relief of David Hurbert (previously referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions)—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of the National German-American Alliance, against the immigration bill (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TRIMBLE: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Robert Langsten and Lizzie R. Ashurst—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILEY of Alabama: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John T. Toppin—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 24, 1907.

The Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE, offered the following prayer:

In my Father's house are many homes. I go to prepare a place for you.

If our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, eternal in the heavens.

They cease from their labors, but their works do follow them. Let us pray.

Father of life, teach us the lesson of life at this moment of sudden death. Thou art pleased to call him to higher service, to see as he is seen, to know as he is known. In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, he is changed, and this corruptible puts on incorruption, and this mortality is clothed with immortality.

We need not pray for him. He comes to Thee in the glad certainties of that larger life. But for ourselves, Father, we pray that our labors may be consecrated to Thee; that we may live to Thy service; that we may go about Thy business; so that when Thou dost call us where we may cease from such labors, we shall enter into the higher service of the sons and daughters of the living God.

We ask it in Him who is immortality and life for us, coming to Thee in the name of Thy well-beloved Son.